CODEX SINAITICUS AND THE SIMONIDES AFFAIR

ΑΝΑΛΕΚΤΑ ΒΛΑΤΑΔΩΝ
33

J. K. ELLIOTT

CODEX SINAITICUS AND THE SIMONIDES AFFAIR

An Examination of the nineteenth century claim that Codex Sinaiticus was not an ancient manuscript

ΠΑΤΡΙΑΡΧΙΚΟΝ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΠΑΤΕΡΙΚΩΝ ΜΕΛΕΤΩΝ
ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗ
1982

ΑΝΑΛΕΚΤΑ ΒΛΑΤΑΔΩΝ

ΕΚΔΙΔΟΜΕΝΑ ΥΠΟ

ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΟΥ Κ. ΧΡΗΣΤΟΥ

ANALECTA VLATADON

EDITED BY

PANAYOTIS C. CHRISTOU

33

J.K. ELLIOTT, *Codex Sinaiticus and the Simonides Affair.*

Copyright: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies

Thessaloniki 1982

Errata.

Most of the typographical errors concerning orthography, punctuation or indentation are obvious. The following are less easily corrected :

p.31 l.16 : attention = readings. On

p.43 ll.10-12 : do not indent.

p.45 l.1 : add many after from

p.54 l.37 : delete %.And Simonides'
l.39 : read written in the last
reverse quotation marks

p.60 l.35: delete concerned

p.68 l.21 : was = saw

p.118 l.36: world

p. 120 l.1 :add been after have

p.122 l.28: I 1 JOHL

p.132 footnote 40: in Tregelles'

p.179 l.13:add who before resembled

p.184 l.4: add the li er after with

p.190 last paragraph : do not indent

J.K.Elliott.

PREFACE

If there is one biblical manuscript and one only that the man in the street has heard of, it is likely to be the Codex Sinaiticus. The romantic story of its discovery by Constantine Tischendorf in the middle of the last century, the public appeal in 1933 which enabled it to be purchased by Britain and the prominence of its display in the British Museum have all given it a notoriety and fame above all other manuscripts.

To the biblical scholar, the contents of this fourth century codex and the distinctiveness of many of its readings have made it a reference book and storehouse of textual variants, which no editor of the Greek New Testament text can ignore. It was largely because of the discovery of this manuscript that the Textus Receptus which had held sway since 1514 lost its preeminence as the Greek New Testament and that a new translation of the bible was undertaken. This was the Revised Version of 1881.

No one nowadays doubts the antiquity and importance of the Codex Sinaiticus but this was not the case in the early 1860's shortly after Tischendorf had announced his discovery. In 1862 a Greek called Constantine Simonides caused a stir in ecclesiastical and literary circles by announcing that the Codex Sinaiticus which Tischendorf was claiming as an ancient manuscript was in fact a recent work, and had in fact been written in 1840 by Simonides himself.

Although Simonides' claims were eventually discredited, for over one year the correspondence columns and editorial pages of various literary and theological journals discussed the rival stories put out by Simonides and his supporters on the one hand, and by Tischendorf and his supporters on the other. Literary and learned societies also discussed the matter.

The whole bizarre episode, which perhaps belongs more to the annals of crime than to the history of palaeography, sheds some interesting sidelights on the discovery and publication of Codex Sinaiticus and on the literary personalities of the day. This monograph attempts to show how the contemporary newspapers and journals analysed the stories of Simonides and Tischendorf By letting the original correspondence speak for itself I hope we are enabled to understand not only the background to the affair but also to sample the tone of the exchanges. We also obtain a fascinating glimpse into the personality not only of Simonides but also of Tischendorf himself

Although I have sometimes shortened the newspaper extracts or divided a letter and quoted it in several different places, I have not interfered with the original wording or standardised the spelling of proper names where there is variation. The published version is repeated exactly. Errors are denoted by my adding (sic).

I should like to acknowledge the help given me by Miss Raper, Mrs. Walker and Mrs. Hart of the Department of Theology, University of Leeds, in preparing the typescript of this monograph, and the Keeper of Antiquities (Dr Downs) in the Liverpool City Museum for allowing me to examine some of Simonides' forgeries.

CONSTANTINE SIMONIDES in 1856 (from *Simonides and sein Prozess,* J. Bernhardt Berlin 1856).

CONTENTS

PREFACE 5

I CODEX SINAITICUS 9
II SIMONIDES 26
III KALLINIKOS 71
IV SIMONIDES THE FORGER 122
V THE BIOGRAPHICAL MEMOIR 173

INDEX 191

I CODEX SINAITICUS PETROPOLITANUS

This Greek manuscript is usually dated in the fourth century, and is called Sinaiticus because it was found in St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai. As it was deposited for many years in the Imperial library in St. Petersburg, the full name of the MS. adds Petropolitanus. In lists of manuscripts, it is usually denoted by the first letter in the Hebrew alphabet, aleph ℵ. Originally the manuscript contained the entire Bible plus two New Testament apocryphal works, but the Old Testament is now incomplete. The Old Testament fragments known as Codex Friderico-Augustanus originally belonged to Codex Sinaiticus. Sinaiticus is a beautifully written manuscript arranged in four columns per page and in neat capital letters throughout.

THE DISCOVERY AND PUBLICATION OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Although the story of the discovery of this manuscript is fairly widely known it is worth the retelling here as several aspects of it were picked on by opponents of Tischendorf and some of these will be referred to later in this monograph.

In 1862 Tischendorf published *Aus dem Heiligen Lande,* which gave an account of his travels in the East. In the ninth chapter he describes how he discovered Codex Sinaiticus. An earlier and briefer account is found in his *Notitia* (1860) and a fuller, later account in his *Die Sinaibibel* (1871).

According to Tischendorf's account, he was on an expedition in 1844 in search of ancient manuscripts under the patronage of his sovereign, King Frederick Augustus of Saxony. While staying in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai he was fortunate enough to discover in a basket of *papers* intended for burning some *vellum* leaves containing portions of the Septuagint. He was informed two such basketloads had already been burned.

Tischendorf was permitted to remove forty three of these leaves and they were eventually published in 1846 as the Codex Friderico – Augustanus and contain 1 Chronicles, Jeremiah with Nehemiah and Esther complete. Of the other portions of this manuscript which Tischendorf saw on that visit, he was permitted only to copy one leaf. This contained the end of Isaiah and the beginning of Jeremiah and was eventually published in 1865 in his *Monumenta Sacra Inedita I.*

It was not until 1853 that Tischendorf returned to St. Catherine's, but at that time was not able to discover the whereabouts of the leaves he had left behind.

The third visit to the Monastery was in 1859 and was extremely profitable. On this occasion his patron was the Emperor Alexander II of Russia — a factor which was to be significant in the history of the manuscript. After having been in St. Catherine's for five days, Tischendorf was talking to the steward of the

monastery and brought the conversation round to the topic of the Septuagint, whereupon the steward produced from his room a manuscript of the scriptures. This turned out to be the manuscript Tischendorf had seen in 1844 and had since been searching for. That night, far from sleeping, Tischendorf examined the manuscript and discovered not only did it contain further portions of the Septuagint but (more significantly) the whole of the New Testament, the Shepherd of Hermas and the Epistle of Barnabas. He transcribed Barnabas that night.

It may be of interest now to see how Tischendorf assessed the significance of his discovery in a supplement to the *Leipziger Zeitung* of April 17, 1859. This takes the form of a letter addressed to the Saxon Minister von Falkenstein and was sent by Tischendorf from Cairo on March 15, 1859. A translation appeared in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* in July 1859:

> The kindness shown to me by your Excellency on my departure from my native land, makes it my agreeable duty to address to you the first account of a very important literary discovery which the Lord's good hand has vouchsafed to my new investigations in the East. You know what weight the learned world attaches to the famous Vatican MS. of the Bible, and how it has for centuries been esteemed one of the special treasures of the Papal library: you are aware how anxious men have been, and how difficult they have found it, to collate even single passages, how earnestly Mai's edition, undertaken by order of the Pope, had been looked for since 1828, and how gladly it was at last received, at Easter 1858, after thirty years delay.
>
> If I should now say that Providence has preserved in the corner of the so - often ransacked cloisters of the East, a MS. which may rank with the Vatican in regard to its character, extent, and age, and which on some accounts claims the precedence of it, I shall not be surprised if some doubt my skill, and the questions be put — Is it indeed true? Is it even possible? And yet as I held in my hands for the first time the precious leaves, in a convent chamber at the foot of Moses Mount (Ghebel Mousa), my own astonishment and wonder were as great as can be imagined.
>
> The MS. of whose discovery I inform you consists of 346 fine and fair parchment leaves of so large a size that two of them have required a whole gazelle skin. The writing, upon each leaf and arranged in four columns, is of the most ancient character, and is mostly (and especially on the outside of the skin) preserved with wonderful distinctness, but on the flesh side it is sometimes less legible, and much more difficult to decide respecting the numerous and certainly very ancient corrections to which the Codex has been subjected.
>
> Such MSS. confessedly never have a date. It is the problem of palaeography, by careful attention to all the pecularities of each separate MS., from the character of the letter-forms employed, from the interpunction, from the use of initials, and subscriptions, and inscriptions: from the parchment, from the tints of the ink, the old corrections, etc., to ascertain

more or less satisfactorily its antiquity.As to this MS., there scarcely was need a date to fix its century, for that it was written in the fourth century can be confirmed by all the arguments which have any weight in palaeographic science, almost beyond all question.

The Vatican Codex goes back to the same century in my opinion and that of other able men. The only other Greek parchment MS. to which I had before given a chronological place prior to the Vatican, was the Leipsic Codex Friderico - Augustanus, but this, as I am already convinced, is a relic of the very MS. of which I am so happy as to find these important constituents.

This MS. still contains, first, considerable portions of the Old Testament, namely, most of the greater and lesser prophets, the Psalms, Job, Jesus - Sirach, Wisdom, and several other Apocryphal books. These are followed by the entire New Testament. And herein lies the extraordinary significance of the discovery. Only three extensive Biblical MSS. of high Christian antiquity have come down to us from the fourth century to the ninth. The most comprehensive among them is the London Codex Alexandrinus, which wants almost the whole of Matthew's gospel as well as considerable part of 2 Corinthians, and two chapters of John's gospel. From the Vatican MS. still more is absent, namely, the Apocalypse and four Pauline epistles altogether, with a third part of the epistle to the Hebrews. But of the MS. of the New Testament now found, not a single leaflet is wanting! It is moreover the only one among the MSS. of the New Testament of a thousand years old and upwards, which is complete. The divine who knows the importance attached to the MSS. of that age, in the endeavour to fix the apostolic text, will accept this as a principal authority. It is a new pledge of the possibility of deciding and restoring the genuine apostolic text, to which this doubtless is a close approximation, as to the main features of it. I only add that my examination of the MS. convinces me of its perfectly coinciding in age with the Vatican Codex.

I have yet to name two other component parts of the same MS., the discovery of which alone would have sufficed to make my new journey fortunate and successful. Next to the Bible, the most precious literature of the church is the writings of the apostolic fathers. We have but few remains of this class, and these few are for the most part often in doubtful texts, imperfect, or only extant in translations. It is thus with the so-called Epistle of Barnabas, which, if not composed by a companion of Paul, must have been written very soon after the end of the first century. It is quoted both by Clement and Origen, in the second and third centuries, as even a part of Holy Scripture, and still later, such writers as Eusebius, refer to it as among the doubtful books of the Canon. This epistle is equal in extent to that to the Romans; several MSS. of it have been found before, but all are modern, and in all alike the first five chapters are wanting, of which the text can be gathered only through a very corrupt Latin version. How great then was

my wonder when I found the whole of Barnabas in this MS., at the close of the Revelation: I could not lay the volume down till I had read and copied the whole text. Divines will no longer have to read from the uncertain Greek text of late MSS., and a faulty Latin version, the epistle which in the second Christian century was so reverently handled and highly prized.

In the height of my joy at this discovery I was to have a last surprise. I found a separate portion of fifty–two columns, with the inscription «The Pastor;» it was the first part of the Pastor of Hermas, also pertaining to the second century, and likewise claiming a kind of apostolic regard. Till recently, its Greek text was thought to be lost. This MS. proves that in the earliest times both Barnabas and Hermas were reckoned as constituent parts of Scripture by some, if their authority was also doubted. Of Hermas, Simonides confessedly brought a very perfect Greek text to Leipsic, part copied by him from a MS. at Mount Athos, and part upon three paper leaves of the fourteenth or fifteenth century. After this text was published in December 1855, and repeated soon after by me more accurately, considerable doubt arose about it, whether it was really ancient or a mediaeval tranlation from the Latin. I especially opposed the last view and my opinion is confirmed by these leaves, at least 1000 years older, shewing that the Leipsic text had been derived from the original but is corrupt and that in consequence of a mediaeval use of the Latin.

I am glad that the scientific mission commited to me by the Russian Government, and promoted by you, has at its outset so noble a literary discovery as its result. Relying upon the Imperial favour, I venture already to set before the learned world the hope of the publication of the MS. A carefully revised copy of its 132,000 columnar lines will be completed by the beginning of April, if God permit. The Vatican MS. was known 300 years before many cherished wishes were gratified in its publication.

It may perhaps need only so many years instead of so many centuries to enrich the Christian literature with that most precious document now discovered.

Constantine Tischendorf

In order to achieve the publication of the manuscript, Tischendorf went to Cairo to consult with the head of the convent for permission to copy the manuscript in Cairo. Eventually letters were duly sent from Cairo to St. Catherine's and the manuscript was brought to Tischendorf, who, with assistants, transcribed it. During this time Tischendorf, devised a more subtle scheme. This was to persuade the monks of Sinai to part with the manuscript for good and to donate it to their patron, and his, the Czar. The actual execution of this plan was complicated by the death of the archbishop of Sinai, whose authority was needed for such an important transaction. Tischendorf's version of the story is that he was allowed to take the manuscript away until the vacant see was filled, having given a promise to return it if unforeseen circumstances should interfere with the scheme

that the monks should make a present of it to the Czar.

Permission was ultimately given by the newly appointed archbishop, but in the meantime Tischendorf had already submitted the MS. to the Czar, who undertook to defray the cost of printing and publishing a handsome limited edition of the manuscript and to assist in the cost of producing a smaller popular edition as well. The *Leipziger Zeitung* of June 24 1860 gave news of this and the following translation appeared in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* of October 1860:

> The journal of St. Petersbourg, dated May 3rd, gives us intelligence respecting the publication of the Sinaitic manuscript, with which Professor Tischendorf has been commissioned by the Imperial Government of Russia. The latter gentleman has since then returned to Saxony; the work itself has been commenced at St. Petersbourg and Leipsic, and we are now in a position to give more accurate information concerning this publication, which has excited so much interest in the remotest spheres. Of three plans which Professor Tischendorf laid before the Imperial Government of Russia with respect to this publication, his Imperial Majesty has approved the one which holds in a certain degree the medium between the two others. According to this, the whole text will be printed, with strict observance of all externalities, by means of such types as will accurately reproduce the writing of the original with its manifold pecularities. These types are cut under the direction of Professor Tischendorf at the foundry of Von Gieserde and Devrieut at Leipsic, and are intended exclusively for the work in question. The text of the manuscript is distributed among three folio volumes, whereof the two first will contain everything belonging to the Old Testament and the third, the New Testament complete, together with the letter of Barnabas and the fragment of the Shepherd of Hermas. To these three volumes will be added a fourth, containing a treatise on the history of the manuscript and the progress of its discovery, on its extraordinary great age, and its importance as regards the science of Biblical text. To this treatise is joined the palaeographico - critical commentary, concerning more than 7000 places altered in the manuscript by the old correctors. This volume will besides be distinguished by twenty plates of photographic facsimiles, which are to familiarize scientific interesting parts. The photographic part of the work is being executed by order and under the control of the publisher in the Photographic Atelier of the imperial staff at St. Petersbourg, whilst the execution of all typographic words takes place in the above-named foundry at Leipsic. The publication itself of the work will take place at St. Petersbourg exclusively, without its appearing in the bookselling world, as all the 300 copies will be reserved by his Imperial Majesty as presents.
>
> The completion of the work being deferred to the year 1862, is intended to illustrate still more the 1000th anniversary of the Russian Empire, which falls in that year. But in order to satisfy the desire of scientific men,

there will be prepared, besides this anniversary edition, another which is to reproduce in a more simple form, although with the same critical precision, the Sinaitic text document. This latter edition, confined at first to the New Testament, with Barnabas and Hermas, will appear at a very moderate price at the printing office of F.A. Brockhaus, and is to be published in the same year, immediately after the anniversary edition. A special communication will in the course of this summer announce the undertaking of this manuscript, from which the reader will already be enabled to pass a judgment as to its critical character of the text, and its scientific importance. It is a matter of course that every earnest inquirer for manuscripts will welcome this very ancient witness of saving truth; misunderstandings alone could induce pious minds to be apprehensive about it.

This advertising communication, printed also by F.A. Brockhaus, will contain information respecting all the results of the discovery, possession, and use of old Greek and Eastern manuscripts.

The following issue of this quarterly journal gives a typical reaction to this announcement.

Of Greek MSS. of the New Testament, there were in existence altogether about 2,000 — of which number between 300 and 400 were in England; many more were in the Vatican and in the Imperial Library at Paris, and in various continental universities. Until recently, there was no MS. known of earlier date than the end of the 4th century; but, about two years since, Tischendorf announced his discovery of a MS. of much earlier date in one of the monasteries of the East — in the Desert of Sinai. This MS. had been eagerly purchased by the Emperor of Russia, who had employed Tischendorf, at a cost of £50,000, to publish it within two years from the present time, in a manner suitable to the dignity of its subject. As yet only a small portion of it had been published[1]; and judging from this specimen, the MS. deserved all the praises that had been bestowed on it. The publication of the whole MS. in 1862, is an event looked forward to with the most lively interest.

Tischendorf and his assistants worked on the manuscript in Leipsic between 1860 and 1862 when the imperial edition appeared to mark the thousandth anniversary of the foundation of the Russian Empire. The original manuscript was subsequently given to the Emperor in St. Petersburg. But it was not until 1869 that the monks received 9,000 roubles from the Imperial government together with a number of Russian decorations in exchange for their gift of the manuscript. When they did receive the money, the monks signed a document stating that they had in fact presented Codex Sinaiticus to the Czar. Only on receipt of this document was the manuscript placed in the Imperial public library in St. Petersburg. And it remained there until 1933 when the soviet government offered it for sale and it was bought by the British Museum.

1. i.e. in Tischendorf's *Notitia Editionis Codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici* (Leipzig, 1860).

REACTIONS TO THE STORY

a) The discovery of Sinaiticus

Tischendorf's story of the discovery of Codex Sinaiticus, his judgment about its age and the means whereby the manuscript was given to the Russians have been looked on with some suspicion, not only when these were first published but more recently. There were certain reasons why suspicions were aroused; some were caused by Tischendorf himself, others by his enemies.

Among the difficulties many of his contemporaries saw in Tischendorf's story is that it was unsubstantiated by any independent witness. Thus, it is not surprising to learn that among many other accusations levelled against Tischendorf is the charge that he stole the manuscript. Certainly the manner in which the manuscript was handed over to the Russians has been the cause of much enquiry. Bruce Metzger[2] prefers to be euphemistic on this point and refers to the negotiations involved in the transfer of the manuscript as «ecclesiastical diplomacy».

At the time the British Museum was about to purchase Codex Sinaiticus a pamphlet was issued *(The Mount Sinai Manuscript of the Bible,* 1934) which tried to establish that the Russians had a perfectly legal right to offer the manuscript for sale. In doing so it largely followed Tischendorf's account of the transfer of the manuscript in the 1860's. However, a recent article by Ihor Ševčenko in *Scriptorium* (Vol. 18, 1964, pp. 55 - 80) entitled «New Documents on Constantine Tischendorf and the *Codex Sinaiticus*» casts doubts on many of the claims made by Tischendorf and the British Museum pamphlet. Ševčenko shows that, until the prolonged negotiations which resulted in the Russian gift to the monks had been finalised, and the monks written receipt donating the manuscript had been signed, Tischendorf was at fault allowing the manuscript to be designated Codex Sinaiticus *Petropolitanus* and premature in handing it over to the Czar. Certainly Tischendorf's own account tends to be masterfully vague when he narrated some of the points crucial to the propriety of the transfer of the manuscript up to 1869. Ševčenko concludes that the offering of Sinaiticus to the Czar in 1862 by Tischendorf was an illegal act. It is this detail in the story which has attracted most attention this century.

Last century, however, other details in Tischendorf's account caused problems.

For instance, Tischendorf was accused of being too reticent in telling the story of his discoveries particularly in the early years. Even F.J.A. Hort, the famous textual critic, in a letter to *The Guardian,* 13th August, 1862, says that «parts of Tischendorf's language about his own discovery have been thought by some to leave room for suspicion». Another journal, *The Literary Churchman,* Ist. September, 1863, asks of Tischendorf «clear and full account properly accredited by the evidence of others of all the details of his discovery first of the

2. The Text of the New Testament 2nd. edition (Oxford, 1968) p. 44.

Codex Friderico - Augustanus and secondly of the Sinaiticus». Without this information *The Literary Churchman* felt unable — with some justification given the magnitude of Tischendorf's claims—to go along wholeheartedly with Tischendorf.

Scrivener too[3], although sympathetic to Tischendorf, regretted that Tischendorf at no time gave an account of how the Codex Friderico–Augustanus had been obtained, although he realises that Tischendorf probably held his tongue for fear of jeopardizing his chances of obtaining the rest of the manuscript on a future visit. A letter to *The Guardian,* 26th August, 1863, by J. E. Hodgkin makes a plea to the editor of that paper to investigate the story of Tischendorf:

> ...May I ask you to use your exertions to obtain from Tischendorf a minute account of his successive discoveries of the two portions of this MS. Am I mistaken in saying that no details of discoveries whatever were offered with the Codex Friderico–Augustanus, at the time of publication. And is not a much more connected and detailed account to be looked for than has yet been published (in English, at least) of the various stages in the discovery and deportation of the remainder of the volume?
>
> ...It is somewhat remarkable that when inquiries were made in February, 1861, at *Mount Sinai,* by the Rev. W. W. Woollcomb, of Salford, about the Biblical MS. sent thence by Tischendorf to the Emperor, the reply of the librarian was «*that he knew nothing about the matter, that he never heard of any MS. being sent to the Emperor, or brought away by Tischendorf*[4]».
>
> Mr. Woollcomb was not able to give him detailed information as to the characteristics of the Codex, and all attempts to identify it, by its connection with the name of Tischendorf, were unsuccessful.

One detail that was given about the finding of Codex Friderico–Augustanus was that it was found in a rubbish basket. A letter published in *The Guardian* on 27th May 1863 from the Revd. J. Silvester Davies one – time chaplain to the British Consul in Alexandria (and whose name is to re–appear in our investigations) quotes a monk of Sinai who in contradiction to what Hodgkin had written stated that according to the librarian of the monastery the whole of Codex Sinaiticus had been in the library for many years and was marked in the ancient catalogues. While this letter was written with the intention of supporting Tischendorf's claim that Sinaiticus (and by extension Friderico–Augustanus which was an original part of the same manuscript as that labelled Sinaiticus) is ancient, it did cause scholars to question Tischendorf's statement about the condition in which he found the manuscript. Is it likely, they wondered, that a manuscript known in the library catalogue would have been jettisoned in the rubbish basket.

---

3. F.H. Scrivener, A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus (Cambridge and London 1864) p. vii.

4. This reply may have been occasioned by the monks' embarrassment at the way they had treated the MS.

Likewise we learn from *The Christian Remembrancer,* July 1862 that «from enquiries made at the convent of St. Catherine's, Mount Sinai, in the month of February last it appears that the monks of the convent agree in stating that the above manuscript (Codex Sinaiticus) was there from time immemorial». We should however not put too much evidence on the monks' version of the story, which could be due to their embarrassment at being exposed by Tischendorf with not having taken due care of one of the literary masterpieces in their library.

The British Museum pamphlet of 1934[5] states (with justification) that «any moral claim that the monastery had to complain of the loss of so historical a treasure is obviously destroyed by the fact that the monks had thrown away a great part of it».

The Literary Churchman, 16th September 1862, comments on another aspect of Tischendorf's story concerning the removal of Sinaiticus:

> Tischendorf's then went to Cairo to consult with the head of the convent as to permission to copy the MS. at Cairo. Having obtained this permission the MS. was brought to Cairo. Here, happily for Tischendorf, a German merchant brought an English scholar (who was it?) to the convent in Cairo to obtain a sight of the treasure. Immediately a report was spread that an offer was made for the MS., and that its value was depreciated in order that it might be bought cheaper. We are rather inclined to believe that all this happened most fortunately for Tischendorf. It is, at all events, most artistically narrated. No sooner has the Englishman appeared upon the scene, than the Prior declares that they would rather make the Grand Duke a present of their treasure than sell it for English gold! The enthusiasm of the Prior to serve the Grand Duke, lighted up by the degrading thought of English gold, is almost theatrical. We have heard it hinted darkly that the poor monks were very sorry to part with their treasure. We have also heard some doubts expressed, whether the monks quite understood that they were taking a final leave of their MS. when they consented to its departure for St. Petersburg. Indeed, in one of the later chapters of the work, after describing all the delays caused by a dispute as to the election of an Archbishop of Sinai Tischendorf fairly acknowledges that he brought away the MS under a promise to return it if unforeseen circumstances should interfere with the intention of the monks to make a present of it to the Emperor.
>
> The horror of English gold is amusingly enough brought forward by Tischendorf as the great motive which induced the monks to part with this long-cherished treasure! We should very much like to know the exact truth of the whole story—the inducements offered to the monks, and all the circumstances connected with this gift—for we are convinced that, although we may have the truth here, we have not the whole truth before us. The account of Tischendorf is evidently made up, and though he tells us as much

5. The Mount Sinai Manuscript of the Bible.

of the truth as he thinks expedient, we feel assured that he has not given us *all* the information which he could afford.

As a footnote to the above the paper quoting from *The Christian Remembrancer,* July 1862, adds:

> Professor Tischendorf, came fortified with requests and guarantees from the Grand Duke Constantine, the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople, and other high personages, to have the MS. as a loan. They (the monks) affirm that they have guarantees for its safe return; but the subject is a sore one with them, and the librarian evidently does not put implicit confidence in the guarantees. Under these circumstances Professor Tischendorf might have spared his allusions to the debasing influence of English gold! He will do better to confine himslf to maintaining the honour of Russia.

Such is the tone of some contemporary criticism of Tischendorf. And it is the tone maintained in recent days by Ševčenko[6].

b) The age and importance of Sinaiticus.

So much for the actual details in Tischendorf's story. Now to the manuscript itself. Nowadays the authenticity and age of Codex Sinaiticus (and that portion of it known as Friderico–Augustanus) are beyond dispute. But this was not the case when the discovery of the manuscript was first announced. Many of the scholars who heard about the manuscript for the first time were justifiably suspicious of the high claims made for the uniqueness of Sinaiticus.

An example of how the learned world read about the manuscript may be seen in the enthusiastic report in *The Journal of Sacred Literature,* April 1863:

> The Codex Sinaiticus is a great fact. It has fairly emerged from its obscurity of ages, and the appearance of a new island would scarcely have been regarded with more interest, than its advent before the eyes of the critical world. A new claimant to the presidency in the republic of Biblical MSS. was of course a very possible occurrence, but it was not generally expected. All at once, however, a celebrated letter from Tischendorf to the minister Von Falkenstein, announced the coming of a *candidate for that presidency,* and of one whose rights might perhaps easily be determined. Codex A, which tradition ascribed to the time of the Nicene Council, and which for a long time was allowed to stand first, as its very name indicates, had been condemned to retire before at least one of its rivals, and to strike off a century or more from its assumed age. The Codex C, or the Ephraem rescript, had won a high position – Tischendorf, for example, puts it before the middle of the fifth century – as early if not earlier than Codex A. The Cambridge manuscript, Codex D, or Beza, has raised a good deal of discussion, but never held its ground as a candidate for the seniority. Of the rest we need not speak, excepting to name the one which had won its way to the

6. op. cit.

> headship – Codex B, or the Vatican MS. This last seemed to be settling down into quiet possession of its honours; and such is the exclusive veneration in which it is held, that it has for a long period been almost as difficult of access as the Grand Lama of Tibet, or his holiness the Pope. It remains to be seen whether the rival dignity of the Sinaitic Codex, which courts publicity, will have any effect in relaxing or removing the restrictions of which we speak. This is not all, it remains to be seen whether the Sinaitic Codex, Aleph, may or may not be compelled to retire into the same rank as its brother Alpha of Alexandria. But whatever may be the ultimate decision of those who are able to investigate and pronounce judgment in the matter, the Codex Sinaiticus is, we repeat, a *fact* and not a myth, and it will always occupy a very high and powerful position among the uncial manuscripts of the Greek Scriptures.

An earlier account of the discovery, in *The Literary Churchman,* 16th July, 1859 resulted in reservations being expressed about Tischendorf's original assessment of its age:

> For ourselves we will only say that we must be content to suspend our opinion until we have further information without in the meantime entirely acceding to the statements of Dr. Tischendorf as to the antiquity of the MS. He is as we all know, the first authority in such matters but in the first warmth of delight at so great a discovery we feel it possible that his enthusiasm may in some degree have warped his judgement. That a wonderful discovery in regard to Biblical criticism has been made, there can be no doubt; whether the MS. will eventually prove to be as old and as valuable as Dr. Tischendorf now believes it to be must be ascertained by the result.

Such a reaction is not surprising in the face of a discovery which claimed to be the oldest complete copy of the New Testament in existence and which contained in addition the Epistle of Barnabas the first five chapters of which had hitherto been known only in Latin.

It is significant that four years later it is the same journal, *The Literary Churchman* above all which gave most credence to the assertion of Simonides that Codex Sinaiticus was not ancient. The antiquity claimed for Sinaiticus by Tischendorf is one of the major reasons why that journal found it difficult to accept Tischendorf's story. On 16th December 1862 *The Literary Churchman* commented that «No manuscript (i.e. of the New Testament) hitherto has been heard of without an omission or without a flaw. Its very perfection is a difficulty». This journal returns to the same theme again on 2nd. February, 1863:

> We are not aware that there is any other old MS. in existence which contains the entire New Testament without any hiatus. This is, to our mind, a most doubtful fact, *in limine.* Even the Canon of Laodicaea (A. 363) omits the *Revelations* of St. John: and as late as St. Jerome's time the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to have been struggling for its place. The idea of finding an entire Codex, containing the *whole* of our present New Testament, in the fourth century, startles us not a little, and forms a *prima facie*

case against its being of so great an antiquity. But we must not prejudge so grave a matter.

Then again in the issue of 16th February 1863 *The Literary Churchman* continues in a similar vein. Reporting a meeting held on February 11th of the Royal Society of Literature we are told that the librarian of Trinity College Cambridge, Mr. W.A. Wright (who is to figure prominently later in our story) introduced a discussion on the «Sinaitic manuscript». After commenting that some present at that meeting suggested that the antiquity of the manuscript was in doubt because of its completeness, its neatness and its very regular penmanship, the editor adds the following:

> To this statement we have to add our own impressions, after examining a facsimile of the Sinaitic MS. for ourselves. We confess to be much staggered. We are unable to believe that a MS. of the fourth century has this completeness, including, *as of course,* the Ep. to the Hebrews, the 2nd. of St. Peter, and the Apocalypse, the latter of which was not in any list formally accepted by the Church before the Council of Laodicea. Other details made us sceptics; such as the insertion, in the Song of Solomon, of *Rubrics* between the verses, assigning too definitely what was said by the «Bridegroom», and what by the «Bride». The saying of Dr. Tregelles, that if we give up the «Sinaitic MS.» we may give up the Alexandrian and the Vatican, does not move us. First, because Dr. Tregelles, if he knows as much of MSS. as he says, must know that neither of these MSS. are, in appearance, as regular, complete, and modern-shaped as this four-columned parchment now adduced; and he may also know, that it is possible the Alexandrian MS. may itself be traced to monks of Mount Athos. The opinion of Wetstein was not favourable to it. But we have no wish to stir controversy about it. It is, anyhow, *not* the complete document which the «Sinaitic MS.» is affirmed to be.

The same points were being made by other papers. *The Christian Remembrancer,* by far the most sympathetic to Tischendorf in the 1860's, extolled the uniqueness of ℵ in the issue of April 1863 in the following way:

> For, not to mention the important sections of the Septuagint, the epistle of Barnabas, and the fragment of Hermas, we have the New Testament complete *from end to end.* With no other known uncial MS. is this the case. The Alexandrine MS. and the Ephraem Rescript were complete once alas: they are so no longer. The Codex Sinaiticus exhibits the Four Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, the Acts, the Catholic Epistles, the Apocalypse, *substantially* just the same as the Church has for centuries received them, its very variations from the received text (where it does vary) been often so many marks of its antiquity. Ipsi remotissimae antiquitatis viri, venerabiles quum orientis tum occidentis patres surgunt testes, suae aetatis homines arcana sanctarum litterarum ex voluminibus hausisse hujus simillimis» If the MS. was written about A.D. 350, S. Ambrose may have seen it; S. Basil

may have seen it; if it was written a few years earlier, Eusebius himself may have had it transcribed, and Constantine may have presented it to some Church.

But despite—or perhaps because of—these magnificent claims, the writer also adds:

> But the question must really be decided by a critical examination of the document itself, made by expert palaeographists. The sooner Professor Tischendorf can have this done, the better will it be for his own credit as a palaeographist, and, we will add, the more will it forward the sale of those copies, the disposal of which has been left in his hands. Whether the examination is made in Germany, France, or England, matters but little, so long as competent persons conduct it. Only let it be done at once.

In the meantime the paper is only able to repeat what Tischendorf himself published. In its next issue (July 1863) *The Christian Remembrancer* reports:

> The peculiarly fine quality of the vellum – the fact that this is the only known manuscript containing four columns on the page, or eight columns on the open leaf, as if it were designed to imitate the older *rolled* books, whose several skins or leaves were fastened together length-wise – the very simple yet graceful shapes of the letters, which resemble so closely those of the Herculanean papyri – the lack of capital letters, and the rare occurrence of a single point for a stop, as in the Herculanean rolls - the brevity of the titles and subscriptions, and these, too, mostly, by a later hand – the unusual order of the books, S. Paul's Epistles preceding the Acts, and that to the Hebrews following the Second to the Thessalonians – the presence, as part of the canonical Scripture, of the works of Barnabas and Hermas – the peculiar character of the text, which is of the most ancient type, sometimes supported only by Cod. Vaticanus or Codex Bezae, sometimes by a very old version, or by a Greek or Latin Father, such as Eusebius or Basil or Jerome sometimes standing quite alone, or in company with two or three or cursive MSS. – the various corrections the primitive text has received from different hands, with inks of many various shades, and at different times, *yet even the latest before breathings and accents came into use*—all these facts, taken together, with nothing considerable to set in the opposite scale, concur in persuading Tischendorf that the middle of the fourth century is, for this venerable Codex, a date, if not certain, yet far from improbable, and, at any rate, neither futile nor glaringly extravagant.

It was in this period before other, and independent, scholars could investigate the manuscript that the Simonides affair was at its height.

c) The readings in Sinaiticus

In addition to the antiquity and completeness of Sinaiticus, the distinctiveness of its readings was another reason why it was looked on with some suspicion.

After the publication of the imperial edition in 1862 a Russian archimandrite Porphyry, who had seen the manuscript at Sinai between Tischendorf's second

and third visits to St. Catherine's, but who had been unable to make use of the manuscript then, published a pamphlet entitled «Opinion of the Archimandrite Porphyry regarding the Sinaitic manuscript which contains the Old Testament incompete and the whole of the New Testament with the Epistle of the Holy Apostle Barnabas and the Book of Hermas» which attacks the orthodoxy of the Codex, One can appreciate that Porphyry had reason to be chagrined that Tischendorf had succeeded in obtaining the manuscript which he had been unable to remove from Sinai, but, again, it is the tone of the criticism, which is of interest, showing that there were certain features about ℵ (in this case its text differing as it does so often from the Byzantine manuscripts)[7] which enabled opponents of Tischendorf to latch onto. Reporting its arrival in St. Petersburg. Porphyry says:

> These relics have been exposed to the sight of the whole people of the capital for the space of two weeks and this people looked affectionately on the relic of Sinaitic antiquity, and kissed it devoutly, knowing nothing of its heretical origin, neither perceiving any foul odour from it. I expect that Tischendorf, knowing well how dangerous this relic is for us, laughed in secret at our blissful ignorance.

This pamphlet was successfully answered by another «Vindication of the Sinaitic Manuscript of the Bible from the Charges brought against it» by A. Noroff (St. Petersburg, 1863).

Tischendorf's own reaction to Porphyry's pamphlet can be seen from a letter he sent to *The Clerical Journal* on 15th January 1863. And again, it is the tone of the exchanges which is significant. The translation given there is as follows:

> Has no one undertaken the translation into English of my *Aus dem heiligen Lande.* As my first *Journey in the East,* in 1846, 1847, has appeated in a translation, I was still more in hopes of the translation of the latest. In this book are presented reliquiae, as well as the most accurate information about the Codex, which, on account of the work being hurried, could not be given in the Prologomena.
>
> A violent *brochure* has recently appeared against the Codex Sinaiticus as of heretical origin, and against me, by Porphyrides of Petersburg, written in Russian. The old Minister of Instruction, Von Noroff, has already replied to it. For myself I shall not otherwise engage in the dirty controversy of a stupid and fanatical monk, who is full of absurd petty jealousy.

This is typical of the way Tischendorf himself deals with opponents as we shall see again shortly.

Sufficient has perhaps now been said to show that the announcement of the discovery of Codex Sinaiticus and the claims made for it were not the cause for uninhibited jubilation. Enemies of Tischendorf found sufficient to attack, and even those sympathetic to the manuscript and its discoverer had reason to withhold their total support.

---

7. This attitude is comparable with that of Dean Burgon in his famous treatise against the Revised Version and against the text of Codex Sinaiticus in The Revision Revised (London, 1883).

SUPPORT FOR TISCHENDORF

But before we turn to examine the major attack on Tischendorf, we may note that the famous textual critic S.P. Tregelles sent a letter from Leipzic to the equally distinguished F. J. A. Hort which was published in *The Guardian* on 13th August, 1862. It explains how he reacted to examining the manuscript:

> I have now spent some days in this place my object being, as you know, to examine the *Codex Sinaiticus*, and to collate some portion as a specimen. Professor Tischendorf allowed me to look at any part of the MS. at his house (1, Linden Strasse) for three days; I have availed myself of this permission to my own great satisfaction; I trust, too, that this has not been without fruit for the benefit of sacred letters; for I have not only inspected the MS., but I have compared several parts with the facsimile edition which is about to be privately issued, and also I have made a collation of the Catholic Epistles....
>
> I know of no reason for judging it to be more recent than the fourth century.
>
> The corrections from different hands are numerous and of various ages, one corrector went over the MS. before the *running titles* of the books were placed at the head of the pages; this is shown by the circumstance that the corrector has made an addition in the upper margin in such a place as has prevented the head-line from occupying its usual position. The very black ink shows the work of the more recent correction very plainly but as to the ancient hands, I rely very little on the colour of the ink alone for its varying shades of blackish, brownish, and reddish seem to depend on other circumstances.
>
> In Tischendorf's great edition the text of the original scribe and his corrections, or those which appear to be contemporaneous, are alone given in the body of the work, all other corrections are to appear in his notes.
>
> In some respects this will be superior to what are called facsimile editions in general; for not only does the type beautifully represent the writing, but the printers have succeded in placing the letters in their true relative position, however cramped or extended in the MS. Indeed I think that Giesecke and Devrieut, the printers, have rendered good services in the way in which they have executed their part. The facsimiles produced by photography and lithography will do very much for giving a true notion of the MS. and its corrections.
>
> The text of the great edition is all printed, the notes on the corrections, & c., alone remain to be completed. The small edition, printed like the extracts in the Notitia, is considerably advanced the Gospels are completed. I have been much interested in visiting the admirable printing - office.
>
> The smaller edition of the New Testament part of the MS., together with Barnabas and the portion of Hermas, is to be published at a very

moderate price—not to exceed five thalers. I suppose that it will be issued before Christmas next.

On one point I believe that I differ materially from Tischendorf as to the writing of the MS. He thinks that he sees traces of various hands having been employed, in such a way that a change of writer must have frequently taken place. I believe that the difference is to be attributed to the scribe having more or less ink in his style, the ink being more or less thick, and the surface of the vellum slightly varying.

Tischendorf agress with me that the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Codex Claromontanus is from the same hand as the rest of that MS. but the differences in this MS. are not so great as in that. If the ink does not flow quite as freely, the forms of letters, especially at the points, will be affected.

Another English scholar who saw the manuscript in Leipzig was Mr. Henry Bradshaw, the keeper of manuscripts in Cambridge University Library. He examined Sinaiticus in July 1862 and formed a similar opinion of its worth as had Tischendorf and Tregelles. Bradshaw also wrote to *The Guardian* 28th January 1863 about Sinaiticus in the following way:

On the 18th of July last I was in Leipzig with a friend and we called on Professor Tischendorf. Though I had no introduction but my occupation at Cambridge, nothing could exceed his kindness: we were with him for more than two hours, and I had the satisfaction of examing the MS. after my own fashion. I had been anxious to know whether it was written in even continuous quaternions throughout, like the Codex Bezae, or in a series of fasciculi each ending with a quire of varying size, as the Codex Alexandrinus, and I found the latter to be the case.... For myself, I have no hesitation in saying that I am as absolutely certain of the genuiness and antiquity of the Codex Sinaiticus as I am of my own existence. Indeed, I cannot hear of any one who has seen the book who thinks otherwise. Let any one go to St. Petersburg and satisfy himself.

Literature for and against Tischendorf's Story:

E. LAUCH «Nichts Gegen Tischendorf» in *Bekenntnis zur Kirche* (1960) 15 - 24.

O. SCHLISSKE, Der Schatz im Wüstenkloster (1953).

L. SCHNELLER, Tischendorf - Erinnerungen, Merkwürdige Auffindung der verlorenen Sinaihandschrift (1954).

H. BEHREND, Auf der Suche nach Schatzen (1960).

V.N. BENESEVIC, Les Manuscrits Grecs du Mont Sinai et le Monde Savant de L' Europe depuis le XVII^e Siècle jusqu' à 1927 (in Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechischen Philologie, 21) (Athens, 1937).

G. PERADZE, Dokumenty, dotyczace zagadnien odnalezienia i tekstu Kodeksu Synajskiego (Warsaw, 1934).

P. USPENSKIJ, Kniga bytija moego I - VIII (1894 - 1902).

A fuller bibliography can be found in *Ihor Ševčenko «New* Documents on Constantine Tischendorf and the *Codex Sinaiticus» Scriptorium* 18 (1964) 55 - 80.

The British Museum published two pamphlets on Codex Sinaiticus, *The Mount Sinai Manuscript of the Bible* (1934) and *The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus* (1951).

II. SIMONIDES

Of all the attacks on Tischendorf's story and Codex Sinaiticus itself the strangest, and in many ways the most fascinating is the claim by a wily Greek, Constantine Simonides, notorious in Europe as a forger, that he himself had written the manuscript in 1840. This announcement was first made in writing in a letter to *The Guardian* before the imperial edition of Sinaiticus had been circulated.

However, Simonides seems to have spoken about the date of Sinaiticus prior to September 1862, in so far as Tregelles knew of this theory before then. He spoke of it to J.E. Hodgkin in 1860 and in a letter to Sir Thomas Phillipps on August 2nd 1861. (See British Library Add MS 52502A folio 348 and the Phillipps-Robinson MS. collection in the Bodleian Library). Towards the end of the last chapter, we quoted the views of Tregelles on Codex Sinaiticus in a letter sent by him to F.J.A. Hort and published in *The Guardian* 13th August 1862. In addition to our earlier quotation from that letter, Tregelles also states «I believe I need hardly say that the story of Simonides that he wrote the MS. is as false and absurd as possible. A man might as well pretend that the Alexandrian and the Vatican MS. is a modern work». Nevertheless it was not until Simonides wrote to *The Guardian* that the scholarly world at large took notice. Various summaries of Simonides' claim appear in such places as Scrivener's *Full Collation*, Kenyon's *Text*[8] and the British Museum Pamphlets[9].

SIMONIDES' STORY

The full letter as it appeared in *The Guardian* 3rd September 1862 is as follows:

THE SINAI MS. OF THE GREEK BIBLE

> Sir — As you have in your impression of August 13 published a letter from a correspondent signing himself F. J. A. H., in which reference is made to me, I must ask you for permission to make a statement in reply. Your correspondent favours you with some extracts from a letter written by Dr. Tregelles, in which the following sentence occurs: «I believe that I need hardly say that the story of Simonides, that he wrote the MS., is as false and absurd as possible».
>
> The MS. referred to is that called the Codex Sinaiticus, now being published under the editorship of Professor Tischendorf, at the expense of the Russian Government. As what Dr. Tregelles calls my «story» has never been published, and as that gentleman can only have heard of it through an indirect medium, it may interest both Dr. Tregelles and your readers to have the «story» direct from myself. I will tell it as briefly as possible.

8. F. Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible. 5th edition revised by A.W. Adams (London, 1975).
9. The Mount Sinai Manuscript of the Bible (1934) and The Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus (1951).

About the end of the year 1839, the venerable Benedict, my uncle, spiritual head of the monastery of the holy martyr Panteleemon in Mount Athos, wished to present to the Emperor Nicholas I., of Russia, some gift from the sacred mountain, in grateful acknowledgeent of the presents which had from time to time been offered to the monastery of the martyr. Not possessing anything which he deemed acceptable, he consulted with the herald Procopius and the Russian monk Paul, and they decided upon a copy of the Old and New Testaments, written according to the ancient form, in caital letters, and on parchment. This together with the remains of the seven apostolic fathers – Barnabas, Hermas, Clement Bishop of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, and Dionysius the Areopagite – they proposed should be bound in gold, and presented to the Emperor by a common friend. Dionysius, the professional calligrapher of the monastery, was then begged to undertake the work, but he declined, saying that the task being exceedingly difficult, he would rather not do so. In consequence of this, I myself determined to begin the work, especially as my revered uncle seemed earnestly to wish it. Having then examined the principal copies of the Holy Scriptures preserved at Mount Athos, I began to practise the principles of calligraphy, and the learned Benedict taking a copy of the Moscow edition of both Testaments (published and presented to the Greeks by the illustrious brothers Zosimas), collated it with the ancient ones, and by this means cleared it of many errors, after which he gave it into my hands to transcribe. Having then received both the Testaments, freed from errors (the old spelling, however, remaining unaltered), being short of parchment, I selected from the library of the monastery, with Benedict's permission, a very bulky volume, antiquely bound, and almost entirely blank, the parchment of which was remarkably clean, and beautifully finished. This had been prepared apparently many centuries ago - probably by the writer or by the principal of the monastery, as it bore the inscription, *ΕΚΛΟΓΙΟΝ ΠΑΝΗΓΥΡΙΚΟΝ* (a Collection of Panegyrics), and also a short discourse, much injured by time.

I therefore took possession of this book, and prepared it by taking out the leaf containing the discourse, and by removing several others injured by time and moths, after which I began my task. First, I copied out the Old and New Testaments, then the Epistle of Barnabas, the first part of the pastoral writings of Hermas in capital letters (or uncial characters) in the style known in calligraphy as ἀμφιδέξιος (amphidexios). The trancription of the remaining Apostolic writings, however, I declined, because the supply of parchment ran short, and the severe loss which I sustained in the death of Benedict induced me to hand the work over at once to the bookbinders of the monastery, for the purpose of replacing the original covers, made of wood and covered with leather, which I had removed for convenience - and when he had done so, I took it into my possession.

Some time after this, having removed to Constantinople, I showed the

work to the patriarchs Anthimus and Constantius, and communicated to them the reason of the transcription. Constantius took it, and, having thoroughly examined it, urged me to present it to the library of Sinai, which I accordingly promised to do. Constantius had previously been Bishop of Sinai, and since his resignation of that office had again become Perpetual Bishop of that place.

Shortly after this, I was placed under the protection of the illustrious Countess Etleng and her brother, A. S. Stourtzas, by the co-operation of two patriarchs; but, before departing for Odessa, I went, over to the island of Antigonus to visit Constantius, and to perform my promise of giving up the manuscript to the library of Mount Sinai. The patriarch was, however, absent from home, and I, consequetly, left the packet for him with a letter. On his return, he wrote me the following answer:

My dearly beloved Son in the Holy Spirit, Simonides; Grace be with you and peace from God.

I received with unfeigned satisfaction your truly valuable transcript of the Holy Scriptures – namely, the Old and New Testaments, together with the Epistle of St. Barnabas and the first part of the pastoral writings of Hermas, bound in one volume, which shall be placed in the library of Mount Sinai, according to your wish. But I exhort you earnestly (if ever by God's will you should return to the sacred Mount Athos) to finish the work as you originally designed it, and he will reward you. Be with me on the 3d of next month, that I may give you letters to the illustrious A. S. Stourtzas, to inform him of your talents and abilities, and to give you a few hints which may prove useful to the success of your plans. I sincerely trust that you were born for the honour of your country. Amen.

Constantius, late of Constantinople. — an earnest worshipper in Christ.

Island of Antigonus, 13th Aug. 1841.

After I have received the above letter, I again went to visit the patriarch, who gave me the kindest and most paternal advice, with letters to Stourtzas after which I returned to Constantinople, and from thence went to Odessa in November, 1841.

In 1846 I again returned to Constantinople, when I at once went over to the island of Antigonus to visit Constantius, and to place in his possession a large packet of MSS. He received me with the greatest kindness, and we conversed on many different subjects, amongst others, upon my transcript, when he informed me that he had sent it some time previously to Mount Sinai.

In 1852 I saw it there myself, and begged the librarian to inform me how the monastery had acquired it but he did not appear to know anything of the matter, and I, for my part, said nothing. However, I examined the MS. and found it much altered, having an older appearance that it ought to have. The dedication to the Emperor Nicholas, placed at the beginning of the book, had been removed. I then began my philological researches, for

there were several valuable MSS. in the library, which I wished to examine. Amongst them I found the pastoral writings of Hermas, the Holy Gospel according to St. Matthew, and the disputed Epistle of Aristeas to Philoctetes (all written on Egyptian papyrus of the first century), with others not unworthy of note. All this I communicated to Constantius, and afterwards to my spiritual father, Callistratus at Alexandria.

You have thus a short and clear account of the Codex Simonides, which Professor Tischendorf, when at Sinai, contrived, I know not how, to carry away; and, going to St. Petersburg, published his discovery there under the name of the Codex Sinaiticus. When, about two years ago, I saw the first fac-similes of Tischendorf[10], which were put into my hand at Liverpool, by Mr. Newton, a friend of Dr. Tregelles, I at once recognised my own work, as I immediately told him.

The above is a true statement of the origin and history of the famous Codex Sinaiticus, which Professor Tischendorf has foisted on the learned world as a MS. of the fourth century. I have now only one or two remarks to make. The name of the professional calligraphist to the monastery of St. Panteleemon was Dionysius the name of the monk who was sent by the Patriarch Constantius to convey the volume from the island of Antigonus to Sinai was Germanus. The volume, whilst in my possession, was seen by many persons, and it was perused with attention by the Hadji John Prodromos, son of Pappa Prodromos, who was a minister of the Greek Church in Tebizond. John Prodromos kept a coffee—house in Galatas, Constantinople, and probably does so still. The note from the Patriarch Constantius, acknowledging the receipt of the MS., together with 25,000 piastres, sent to me by Constantius as a benediction, was brought to me by the deacon Hilarion. All the persons thus named are, I believe, still alive, and could bear witness to the truth of my statement.

Of the internal evidence of the MS. I shall not now speak. Any person learned in palaeography ought to be able to tell at once that it is a MS. of the present age. But I may just note that my uncle Benedict corrected the MS. in many places, and as it was intended to be re-copied, he marked many letters which he purposed to have illuminated. The corrections in the handwriting of my uncle I can, of course, point out as also those of Dionysius the calligraphist. In various places I marked in the margin the initials of the different MSS. ftom which I had taken certain passages and readings. These initials appear to have greatly bewildered Professor Tischendorf, who has invented several highly ingenious methods of accounting for them. Lastly, I declare my ability to point to two distinct pages in the MS., though I have not seen it for years, in which is contained the most unquestionable proof of its being my writing.

10. These must be the portions of Luke XXIV which Tischendorf appended to his Notitia Editionis Codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici (Leipzig, 1860).

In making this statement, I know perfectly well the consequences I shall bring upon myself but I have so long been accustomed to calumny, that I have grown indifferent to it and I now solemnly declare that my only motive for publishing this letter is to advance the cause of truth, and protect sacred letters from imposition.

In conclusion, you must permit me to express my sincere regret that, whilst the many valuable remains of antiquity in my possession are frequently attributed to my own hands, the one poor work of my youth is set down by a gentleman who enjoys a great reputation for learning, as the earliest copy of the Sacred Scriptures.

C. Simonides

The letter was repeated in *The Literary Churchman* 16th December, 1862, and *The Journal of Sacred Literature,* October 1862.

Subsequent upon this letter, Simonides supplemented his story in another communication to *The Guardian* (21st January 1863) in which he provided a further motive for copying the manuscript by hand:

The discovery of the library induced my uncle to establish a printing - press at Athos for the dissemination of the various unpublished MSS. and those which he was preparing for publication.

For this purpose I was urged by him to go to Athens, and provide there everything requisite for printing. I went and placed myself under the direction of A. Coromela for a sufficient time, he being then the first printer in Athens, and on this account also some spoke disrespectfully of me. I wrote to my uncle from Athens duly, that it was impossible for any one to obtain a proper printing - press in Greece, because the Greeks themselves procured from France every requisite for printing. Being assured of this by others also, he recalled me to Athos. I sailed from the Piraeus in the month of November, 1839, and landed again at Athos for the fifth time. After a few days I undertook the task of transcribing the Codex, the text of which, as I remarked before, had many years previously been prepared for another purpose. But Benedict, as well as the principals of the monastery, wishing to recognise with gratitude the munificence of the Emperor Nicholas on the one hand, and desiring on the other to acquire a printing - press without expense, and being unable otherwise to effect these purposes, decided that a transcript of the Sacred Scriptures should be made in the ancient style, and presented as a gift to the Emperor Nicholas, and he found that all the heads of the monastery perfectly agreed with him. Accordingly, having again revised the books ready for publication, and first Genesis, he gave it to me to trancribe.

In addition to stating the above, Simonides indulges in a polemic against Tregelles:

Dr. Tregells *(sic)* in the *Guardian* of August 13 says that in three days only he went through the MS. of the pseudo - Sinaitic Codex, examined it, compared it with other MSS., and copied several parts. This was blindly

believed by everyone, although I am sure from what he says that he possesses a very superficial knowledge of such matters. Surely if Dr. Tregells could perform such a Herculean work in three days, could not my uncle, a man of acknowledge learning and experience in such matters, reperuse his work while I was transcribing the book of Genesis.

Tregelles made reply to this in *The Guardian* on 11th February, 1863;

I was *almost* surprised that Simonides (or his coadjutor) could in the *Guardian* of January 21st have professedly taken from that very number of the *Guardian* that Dr. Tregelles says that in three days only he went through the MS. of the pseudo - Sinaitic Codex, examined it, compared it with other MSS., and copied several parts. This was «blindly believed by every one». Now, as I never pretended to «perform such a Herculean work in three days» all the deductions of Simondes and his friends are worth nothing, for they are all based on their own false citation.

In three of the days (not consecutively) that I was at Leipsic, I examined the MS., collated the Catholic Epistles, and noted particular attention. on intermediate days I examined the printed sheets, and noted readings or passages to which I thought that it would be well to pay particular attention. Now I have myself examined very many ancient Greek MSS., I have collated *all* such that are known and accessible, containing the Greek New Testament, or any part of it and I feel as much confidence in the genuineness and antiquity of Cod. Sinaiticus, as I do in that of Cod. Vaticanus or Cod. Alexandrinus. A man might make a facsimile of a page or two which might at first deceive but how can this be done, with the corrections of various hands and various ages. Whoever pretends that Cod. Sinaiticus can be modern, virtually asserts that it was intended to deceive.

Were such claims as Simonides to be made nowadays they would be readily dismissed. But between the letter of September 3rd and the end of the following year a vast amount of correspondence and comment resulted from the original and subsequent claims made by Simonides. It must of course be remembered that the Simonides controversy was at its height at a time when only a few had seen Codex Sinaiticus itself or the facsimiles which had been published in either the *Notitia* or in the imperial edition. The difficulties created by Tischendorf's own story of the discovery of the manuscript and high claims made for it inevitably made those who heard Tischendorf's initial reports somewhat sceptical.

REACTION TO SIMONIDES' STORY

Let us now follow the sequel to Simonides letter of September 3rd as it appeared month by month for the year following, first in Germany then in England.

The German press in fact gave the story short shrift. *The Clerical Journal,* 2nd October 1862 reported the immediate and hostile reaction of Tischendorf himself to Simonides story. As with Porphyry's pamphlet (p. 22) the German scholar was very dismissive. *The Clerical Journal* obviously regrets that Tischendorf did not discuss fully the claim of Simonides:

We have said that Dr. Tischendorf would not attempt to exonerate himself from the charge of ignorance which has been brought against him. He has, however, sent a brief note upon the subject to the *Allgemeine Zeitung,* and it appears in that journal under date of September 22nd. Dr. Tischendorf says that he perceives from a number of English papers which have been sent to him, that «the Greek who has rendered himself so notorious by this falsifications» has got into his head some «shameless fantasies in regard to the 'Codex Sinaiticus'». He wonders that English journals should concern themselves about such a matter, and thinks it can only be accounted for by remembering that certain ludicrous characters in the dramas of Shakespere are fashionable among us: «This is shown by the way in which the matter is handled by them, and unhappily the want of tact of certain German scholars has only made him yet more impudent». So far as we are concerned, our reason for taking up the question was the hope that some who are unfamiliar with such subjects might see the absurdity of the claims of Dr. Simonides.

Dr. Tischendorf will not discuss the question because he thinks it contemptible but he says,«For the sake of the English reader I allow myself this observation,—that the simplest schoolmaster in any corner of England would be put to shame if, after a few glances at the manuscript, he failed to recognize what sheer fool's babble the story of Simonides is. This story is just as clever as if he should suddenly come forward with the assertion—naturally certified by an autograph letter by Justinian—that he, and no one else, had built the Sinaitic monastery by command of his imperial majesty». This is about all that Dr. Tischendorf thinks it worth while to say, but it is enough to shew the light in which he views the novel assumptions of Simonides. They are ridiculous: the man who puts them forward is lost to shame, and is a notorious falsifier of manuscripts. They are as unreasonable as the assertion that he was the builder of a convent which is known to have been founded thirteen centuries ago. Such is the judgement of Dr. Tischendorf.

Perhaps it may be said that this is only to pooh - pooh the question, and that it would hace been more respectful and dignified for him to have given some of his reasons for rejecting what Dr. Simonides says. Now a man is not to be put down by being barked at and called ill names and at first sight Dr. Tischendorf seems to blame. But let us remember, that he has published in detail his reasons for his opinion of the age of the «Codex» and it would have been mere waste of time to have repeated them. They may be seen, for example in the *Notitia Codicis Sinaitici* which Dr. Simonides has read. They are endorsed by the suffrages, which, we repeat, have been unanimous, of all the great critics who have been invited to examine the «Codex» or who have inspected the *facsimile,* the accuracy of which Dr. Simonides himself attests.

A fuller letter appeared a few months later, when Tischendorf wrote to the

Allegemeine Zeitung, 23rd. December, 1862 (which was translated as follows in *The Parthenon,* 24th January 1863).

The Codex Sinaiticus written in 1839. Any one in Germany who recollects the palimpsest forgeries of Simonides, by means of which, notwithstanding previous brandings and imprisonments in Greece, he contrived to outwit some of the most renowned German *savants,* until he was unmasked by myself towards the end of January, 1856, and arrested as a forger in consequence of similar convictions obtained against him simultaneously in Berlin, will probably find it incredible that this same (we refrain from translating the epithet used in the original) should yet at this present moment find in England papers ready to print his insane fancy, that he had in his youthful days (in 1856 he gave his age as thirty-three years see Lycurgos's *Enthüllungen,* p. 45,) the pleasure of writing the Codex Sinaiticus and it will be equally increbible that he should by these phantasies actually puzzle some people. The splendid edition of the manuscript, in four volumes, which has just left the press, and of which one hundred copies are for sale, will at once convince every competent judge who may still entertain any doubt upon the matter, that Simonides could not have chosen a more unfavourable subject for his impudent inventions. He pretends to have taken a Moscow Bible manuscript as the basis, and to have compared manuscripts from Mount Athos. But in the New Testament alone the Sinaitic text differs essentially *(principiell)* in several thousand places from all the Moscow editions, and all the manuscripts which have been written within the last thousand years occasionally it stands quite alone in its readings sometimes it agrees only with the Vatican or the Cambridge manuscripts, and contains many readings which must appear gross heresies in a copy destined as a present to the orthodox emperor. Again, in the Old Testament, the text of Tobit and Judith, for example, are of quite a different recension – a recension still preserved principally in old Latin and old Syraic documents. How could this have been taken from the Moscow edition? or how could it be brought into it? Equally unfortunate with this assertion about the source is his fable of the initials which he says he painted on the margin, and of which there is not the slightest trace in the manuscript. A clumsy misconception of my words only has given rise to this fable.

But instead of heaping up proofs - which are within easy reach of every amateur with some little leisure at his command - against this bold fabulist and rival of Palaephatus, it is more to the purpose to invite every one who is still really deceived to an inspection of the Leipsic Codex Friderico -Augustanus, at least if a journey to St. Petersburg is too much to ask.

Simonides certainly took good care, during his long stay at Leipsic, not to say that he was the writer of this much prized treasure of the University library, where he was a constant visitor since, in that case, a place would doubtless soon have been found for him in a lunatic asylum.

> But sound eyes and ordinary common sense are quite sufficient for the purpose of seeing the absurdity of the Simonidean tale, even if there should be people who still believe in the genuineness of his palimpsests and of all his former and later fabrications, the genuineness of which is still unflinchingly upheld by himself. But then, «mundus *vulti* decipi» and «*volent* non fit injuria».
>
> ***Tischendorf***

In the following year Tischendorf published a pamphlet «Die Anfechtungen der Sinai Bibel» (Leipzig 1863) which begins with what *The Literary Churchman* review of 1st July 1863 «a flippant tirade against Simonides» which is «mere banter and ridicule and does not advance anything in the shape of legitimate argument against Simonides». *The Literary Churchman* in fact had been proposing throughout the controversy that the two men meet. For example in its issue of 16th January, 1863 we read:

> We venture to propose at once that Dr. Tischendorf be invited to meet M. Simonides, and challenge him to the proof of his «authorship» of the now supposed «Sinaitic MS».We are willing to be of any use in convening a meeting on the subject, if MM. Tischendorf and Simonides will inform us of their desire to effect it. We shall be glad to receive communications at once from all who can assist us in bringing matters to an issue.

But this came to nothing.

The main debate was to continue, but largely confined to the columns of the English press, which took the matter seriously.

The Journals reporting the Controversy

The following seven were the main papers concerned, extracts from some of which have already been given. The first two are the more important.

1. The Guardian–a weekly newspaper which began publication in 1846. This was the main paper against Simonides.

2. The Literary Churchman– a fortnightly newspaper published in Oxford from 1855 to 1892.

This was the main paper supporting Simonides although its own attitude is claimed in numerous editorials to be strictly neutral. This policy of being unbiased appears in 16th December, 1862:

> For ourselves, we must profess entire impartiality. We are for finding out the *truth.* Though we were quite ready from the first to admit the importance of the discovery of Tischendorf, we are not prepared, at this moment, to say, with Dr. Tregelles, that the statements of Simonides are «as false and absurd as possible». Tischendorf applies these terms «false and absurd» just now to Tregelles himself: and indeed the proverbially furious way in which critics abuse one another, and the pettiness of their jealousies have had much illustration of late. In the interest of Literature, it is our business at least to be calm. It will not do for the journalists to lose their

temper. There are so many quiet questions which may be asked on this whole subject, that we cannot understand the anger of some who have been writing about it.

These protestations of neutrality wear rather thin when repeated in the issues of lst. January 1863, 16th January 1863 and 7th February 1863. The following editorial appears in the issue of lst. June, 1863:

> Our position in relation to the very important controversy respecting this MS. has been one of neutrality to the utmost of our power from the first. We desire still to hold that position.
>
> As for ourselves,—we shall not be deterred by all the superficial partizanship of some, nor by the dreary jocoseness of others, from treating this grave subject with the impartiality which it demands, and seeing it conducted, if possible, to an unequivocal result.

And similar views occur in the issue of lst July, 1863 and lst September, 1863. Even by the end of that year when the odds were heavily against the supporters of Simonides, *The Literary Churchman* felt able to write the following:

> Our contemporary, *The Guardian,* contributes but little to a solution of the enquiries raised, by hasty partizanship. We believe that the respective claims of TISCHENDORF and SIMONIDES are not so judged in Germany as in some of our English coteries. As for ourselves, *pendente lite,* we shall maintain the neutrality which we announced at the beginning. Sacred literature will gain by no other course.

The attitude of *The Literary Churchman* in this controversy is castigated by Tregelles with particular reference to the initial reporting in December 1862 in a letter he sent to *The Guardian,* 11th February, 1863. The editor of *The Literary Churchman* voices his sense of grievance at Tregelles' censure in his following issue:

> In a letter to «The Guardian» of the 11th instant, he charges the *Literary Churchman* with having treated with jocoseness this question of the Sinaitic MS.; and all our readers are aware that none have been so *earnest* as we have been, and, we hope, none more dispassionate. This statement of Dr. Tregelles, therefore, disqualifies him from being accepted as a witness in such a matter as this now before us his passions are excited.

3. *The Journal of Sacred Literature*–a quarterly which was in existence from 1848–1868.

4. *The Christian Remembrancer* a quarterly which was published from 1819—1868.

5. *The Parthenon* under this title existed only in 1862 - 1863. Previously it had been entitled *The Literary Gazette and Journal of Belles Lettres.*

6. *The Clerical Journal* (formerly *The Church Journal* and *Clerical and University Chronicle)* was published from 1853 - 1869.

7. *The Athenaeum.* Quotations from this journal in this monograph refer to the London Literary and Critical Journal which was published between 1828 and 1921.

The personalities involved in the controversy

(i) *Opponents*

A) Among those who were Simonides' main critics were W.A. Wright who was the principle challenger. He was librarian and fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. His letters appeared as follows:

The Guardian: 5th November, 1862
The Guardian: 10th December, 1862 (repeated in part in *The Christian Remembrancer* July 1863)
The Literary Churchman: 1st January, 1863
The Guardian: 21st January, 1863
The Parthenon: 24th January, 1863*
The Guardian: 28th January, 1863*
The Guardian: 4th February, 1863*
The Guardian: 11th February, 1863*
The Guardian: 29th July, 1863
The Guardian: 11th November, 1863

* These were all reprinted in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* July 1863.

The other critics and the publication dates of their letters were:

B) Henry Bradshaw, Keeper of Manuscripts in Cambridge University Library and Fellow of King's College.

The Guardian: 28th January, 1863 (reprinted in *The Journal of Sacred Literature,* July 1863).

C) S.P. Tregelles

The Guardian: 11th February, 1863 (reprinted in *The Journal of Sacred Literature, July 1863).*

D) W.S.W. Vaux secretary to the Royal society of Literature.

The Guardian: 18th February, 1863 (reprinted in *The Journal of Sacred Literature,* July 1863).

E) W. T. Newenham *The Guardian*: 28th January, 1813

The Guardian: 18th February, 1863 (reprinted in *The Journal of Sacred Literature,* July 1863).

(ii) Defenders

(A) Among the personalities involved in this controversy the main writer who regulary defended Simonides in the above journals was J. E. Hodgkin. Letters from him appeared in the following journals on the following dates:

The Guardian: 14th January, 1863 (2 letters). (Repeated in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* July 1863).

The Guardian: 21st January, 1863
The Guardian: 28th January, 1863
The Parthenon: 31st January, 1863 (repeated in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* July 1863)

The Guardian: 18th February, 1863 (repeated in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* July 1863)
The Guardian: 22nd July, 1863
The Guardian: 26th August, 1863
The Literary Churchman: lst September, 1863
The Literary Churchman: 1st December, 1863
The Guardian: 2nd December, 1863

(B) Another defender, extracts from whose letters will appear in our investigations is the monk Kallinikos of Alexandria. His letters appeared in
The Guardian: 3rd December, 1862 (and in a slightly different form in *The Literary Churchman*: 16th December, 1862)
The Literary Churchman: lst January, 1863
The Guardian: 14th January 1863 (4 letters all of which were reprinted in *The Literary Churchman*: 16th January, 1863).
The Literary Churchman: 2nd November, 1863.
The Guardian: 11th November, 1863 (and reprinted in *The Literary Churchman* 16th December, 1863).

C) The main defendant of Simonides' story was of course Simonides himself. Initially Simonides ignored the main attacks on his original story by Wright in his *Guardian* letters of 5th November, 1862 and 10th December, 1862– as Wright himself is quick to point out in his letter of lst January, 1863 to *The Literary Churchman*. Then Simonides made a lengthy reply in *The Guardian* on 21st January, 1863. *The Literary Churchman* regularly pointed out that Simonides was to write a book refuting Tischendorf's claims about Sinaiticus (e.g: in its issues of 2nd. February, 1863, and 16th February, 1863, where it is stated that the book is expected before Tischendorf's promised visit to England that May. In the event, neither happened). Tischendorf's visit to England was delayed until 1865 by which time it is unlikely Simonides was still in the country. At first, Simonides *(The Clerical Journal,* 25th September, 1862) refused to reply to the anonymous critique of his views published in their issue of 11th September, 1862 in the following way:

THE CODEX

SINAITICUS?

> Sir,– I have no intention of replying to your criticism of September 11, nor to any of those which my letter to the *Guardian* may elicit in the public journals, until the discoverer of the Codex has endeavoured to exonerate himself from the charge of ingorance involved in my statement. Nor do I feel myself called upon to reply at all to *anonymous* antagonists. I have, therefore, merely to remark, that I adhere rigidly to the narrative I have already given, which has long been in the hands of my friends, in London and elsewhere (with one of whom I find Dr. Tregelles has maintained a

brisk correspondence), and the truth of which I have far ampler means of substantiating than you can possibly imagine.

I am, Sir, your obediently,
C. Simonides

When he finally did send a lengthy reply to his opponents in *The Guardian* on 21st January, 1863, he began by stating his original intention to maintain a silence:

> You prepared yourself, my dear Sir, for the defence of the Sinaitic Codex by swallowing indiscriminately all the falsehoods concerning its discovery, told by your famous Tischendorf. But what scientific proofs have you to confirm its genuiness. Certainly none: neither do I expect such from you nor from your friend Tischendorf, for neither you nor he possess the true knowledge of Palaeographical Science. You have only learned to say at random, this is genuine, and this is spurious, but you do not know the reason. But although I possess many proofs of the spuriousness of the manuscript, I shall keep silent on these for the present. First, because I intend to write a special work on the subject and secondly because the Codex will prove this itself when published and the portion already published partly shows this.

This opened the flood gates. The following full list of the letters by Simonides on the topic of Codex Sinaiticus is in chronological order

The Clerical Journal: 25th September, 1862 (reprinted in *The Journal of Sacred* Literature July 1863)

The Clerical Journal: 2nd October, 1862 (reprinted in *The Journal of Sacred* Literature July 1863)

The Guardian: 3rd. December, 1862

The Guardian: 10th December, 1862 (reprinted in *The Literary Churchman* 16th December, 1862)

The Guardian: 14th January, 1863

The Guardian: 21st January, 1863 (and reprinted in *The Literary Churchman* 2nd February 1863 and (in part) in *The Christian Remembrancer* April, 1863)

The Literary Churchman: 2nd February, 1863

The Guardian: 4th February, 1863 (reprinted in *The Journal of Sacred Literature,* July 1863)

The Literary Churchman: 2nd March, 1863

The Guardian: 11th March 1863

The Literary Churchman: 13th March, 1863

The Literary Churchman: 16th June, 1863 (reprinted in *The Guardian* 17th June 1863 and in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* July 1863)

The Literary Churchman: 1st July, 1863 (reprinted in *The Guardian* 1st July, 1863)

The Guardian: 26th August 1863 (reprinted in *The Literary Churchman 1st September, 1863).*

THE REACTION TO SIMONIDES' LETTERS

Naturally, many details of Simonides' letter of September 3rd 1862 created immediate questions. Let us now collect together the main points raised by the above critics in correspondence columns and editorials of the various journals listed obove.

a) General Reaction

One of the first reactions to Simonides' original letter was surprise. Many commentators wished to know why Simonides had waited so long after the announcement of the discovery of Codex Sinaiticus before publishing «the true facts» about the manuscript. *The Clerical Journal* of 11th September 1862 asks:

> First of all, we would ask why Dr. Simonides has not published his statement earlier: The first announcements of the discovery of the Codex were made in 1859, and were speedily followed by minute descriptions of the volume and its contents. Narratives more or less detailed continued to appear, till, in 1860, Dr. Tischendorf issued his *Notitia editionis codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici,* with a circumstantial narrative, collations, extracts, various readings, and allusions to Dr. Simonides and his text of Hermas. Subsequently other accounts were multiplied; a magnificent edition in facsimile was undertaken, and a second for more popular use. The time is now come for the completion of the splendid edition executed at so much pains and cost. Through all this, Dr. Simonides has been imperturbably silent, and only at the last moment does he write to undeceive the world. He repudiates his private intimations of the asserted fact, although he admits having seen and recognized the facsimiles two years ago. We can only say that such conduct is most unaccountable, and that a man who was in possession of so momentous a secret ought to have proclaimed it on the house - tops. This has not been done, and Simonides must take all the consequences of his tardy confession.

The Journal of Sacred Literature (October 1862) repeats these comments.

The accusation that Simonides allowed two years to elapse before sending his letter to *The Guardian* is rebutted by J. E. Hodgkin in a letter to the same journal 28th January 1863 in which he states:

> It is now just three years since Simonides first committed to writing in England (in a letter to Mr. Charles Stewart, dated 4th (16th) Jan., 1860) his version of the Codex Sinaiticus. He had his own reasons, I suppose, for not letting the whole public into the secret at an earlier period than last autumn, but the facts of his early claim are well known to his friends. It was not till he saw in Mr. Newton's hands the facsimile of the Codex Sinaiticus, published by Tischendorf, that he felt as perfectly assured as he has since done that the MS. was his own work.

The letter of January 1860 referred to here, which so conveniently excuses Simonides of being tardy in making his claim on Sinaiticus, was not in fact produced until *The Guardian* printed it in the following August (26th August 1863) and repeated in *The Literary Churchman* 1st September 1863. The reason for the

delay is emphasised by Hodgkin in his introduction to the letter in *The Literary Churchman*(1st September 1863).

> Dear Sir, - The accompanying letter is an accurate copy of that written by Simonides, on the 4 - 16 Jan., 1860, to Mr. Charles Steuart, of Brighton, claiming the «Codex Sinaiticus» as his own performance. I deeply regret that an accurate translation of this letter did not appear at an early stage of the controversy...
>
> ...(here follows the letter)...
>
> The original letter is in the hands of Mr. H. C. Steuart, 41, Great Percy Street, Islington, to whose kindness I am indebted for the permission to make the copy which I now enclose.
>
> I am, Dear Sir, yours truly,
> *J. Eliot Hodgkin*

This letter of 1860 is discussed later (p. 46 and p. 55)

(b) *The Quantity of the Work*

Charles Steuart *(sic)* referred to above by Hodgkin was the author of *A Biographical Memoir of Constantine Simonides,* on the title page of which his name is spelt Stewart. We shall be discussing the contents of this *Memoir* in the concluding chapter. But it is of significance at this stage. The *Memoir* was published in 1859, that is before Simonides had written even the letter of 1860 which claims Sinaiticus as his own. This *Memoir,* which serves to illuminate the background of Simonides and defend the authenticity of manuscripts which he had discovered up to that date does not mention anything about Simonides' transcribing Sinaiticus in 1839 - 40—surely a significant achievement worthy of comment in a biography. W.A. Wright picked on this omission in his first letter on this topic to *The Guardian* 5th November 1862.

> ...Let us now turn to the«Biographical Memoir»and see what was happening to Simonides during these months. He arrived at Mount Athos in November, 1839, «where he found his relative Benedict living in the monastery of Rhosos. In this monastery he remained some time studying theology under Benedict, who was a most accomplished scholar and a great linguist» (p. 4). Benedict had in his possession a number of ancient manuscripts, and by information received from an aged monk, Gregory, on his death - bed, he became the discoverer of a valuable library which had been buried in a secret hiding—place under the ruins of an extinct monastery. The story of the discovery is almost pathetic: how Simonides wept and Benedict groaned at the sight of the treasures which they saw piled in confusion on the floor. The MSS. were removed to a neighbouring room, and from that time Benedict set aside everything else, and applied himself day and night to the care of his treasure. But his eyes failed him and he instructed his nephew, Simonides, in the art of palaeography, that he might be able to read and enjoy the MSS. On the 29th of August, 1840, Benedict died.

> At the very time, therefore, when according to his letter Simonides was occupied in learning the principles of palaeography and transcribing the Old and New Testaments, he is described in the «Biographical Memoir» as adding to his already enormous labours the task of reading and copying ancient MSS. for his uncle, and prosecuting the study of theology. Not a hint is given in the Memoir of the transcript for the Emperor of Russia, although in the letter this is the object for which he acquired the art of palaeography, which in the Memoir is turned to account in deciphering and transcribing the MSS. which had been buried in the hidden library.

Another detail in the *Biographical Memoir* which Wright could well have drawn our attention to (but did not) is that not only did the Memoir fail to mention Simonides was writing Sinaiticus, but that it *does* state that Tischendorf had discovered a manuscript, which seems to meet the description of ℵ, without doubting Tischendorf's claims about the manuscript. On p. 61 of the *Memoir* Stewart in order to defend the likelihood that some of Simonides' manuscripts are very ancient compares them to the antiquity of one of Tischendorf's recent finds: «M. Tissendorf *(sic)* also lately discovered in a certain monastery in Egypt the Old Testament and part of the New as well as the first book of Hermas, all of which were written in the second century or 1750 years ago. The manuscript is represented to be in excellent condition». This was written in 1859 and certainly seems to be referring to the newly discovered ℵ At this stage Stewart is clearly unaware that Simonides could have been the scribe of this manuscript.

(c) Simonides' Age

Another point made by Wright in this letter of 5th November 1862 is that according to the *Memoir* Simonides was only 15 years old in 1839. To have performed the herculean task of copying Codex Sinaiticus at that age seemed to many to be incredible. In a long letter to *The Guardian* published on 21th January 1863 Simonides broke his silence and dealt with the criticisms that had been levelled at him. With regard to his age he states that he was in fact 19 not 15 in 1839:

> First, I say that my revered parents are happily still alive, and say that I was born in the year 1820, November the 5th, on Sunday, the sixth hour before noon. The circumstance is confirmed by the certificate of the priest who baptised me, who still lives, a worthy abbot in the monastery of the Taxiarchs in the island of Syme, which is erected in the ancient town called Aigle, and commonly named Michael. This certificate is countersigned by the Senators of the island of Syme, and sealed with the seal of the island, and signed also by the Austrian agent resident there. This certificate, with other documents confirming all I say, I am ready to show to any one who desires to see them[11]. In the face of such evidence not another word need be said.

11. This certificate is in the British Library Additional MS 42502 A folio 54.

Simonides again defends the earlier birthdate in a letter to *The Literary Churchman* 16th March 1863 and even brings Tischendorf to his aid:

> Concerning my birth, I repeat that I was born on the 5th of November, 1820, as my baptismal register shows and that my parents were married in the year previous and this Tischendorf himself has stated in print, saying in 1856 that I was then 36 years of age.

And J. E. Hodgkin in a P. S. to a letter he sent to *The Guardian* of the following week blames himself for perpetuating the error in Stewart's *Memoir.*

> I observe in the long letter of Simonides published in the *Guardian* of Jan. 21 that he states he was born on the 5th of November, 1820, and I have no doubt myself that he is as old as he there claims to be.
>
> But in the *Athenaeum* of December 21, 1861, he made the statement that he was born on the 11th of November, 1824. It is right that the wide discrepancy should be pointed out, though I have no doubt that it arises from inadvertence. The letter to the *Athenaeum* above referred to was not, like his letters to the *Guardian,* a translation from the Greek, but was written by myself, as the embodiment of the line of Simonides' defence, gathered from numerous conversations held with him and I extracted the notice of his birth, and parentage, with his sanction, from Mr. Stewart's Biographical Memoir, which it now seems was in error. I think, Simonides was very much to blame in allowing me to copy a mistake of so important a nature into a letter intended for the instruction of the public on points connected with his personal history but I am fully convinced that carelessness and not the intention to deceive led him to sanction the repetition of an erroneous statement which had no bearing whatever on any of the questions under discussion, and which could in no degree strengthen his defence.

Tregelles (*Guardian* 11th February 1863) comments on this as follows:

> Simonides seems to be singularly unfortunate in his assistants and translators: ... all alike seem to succeed in misrepresenting him it thus becomes a question *who* is responsible for *any* statement. As to what is put forth with the name of Simonides, we know not how much is said *for* him by his friends; it would be better for them to write under their own names, and for Simonides to print all that he has to say in plain and intelligible Greek. The denial by Simonides of the date of his birth, Nov. 11, 1824, stated thus *by him* at Cambridge in the presence of Mr. Wright and Mr. Bradshaw, and *for* him by Mr. C. Stewart and by Mr. J. E. Hodgkin, and his assertion now made that it took place Nov. 5, 1820, ought to cause his friends (and even his coadjutors) to stand in doubt of all that he affirms. In Mr. C. Stewart's Memoir, the date of Nov. 11, 1824, is twice given, pp. 2 and 74 – (if a mistake had been made he could have corrected it in the second place); and as his parents' marriage is stated (p. 74) to have taken place in 1823, it is remarkable that he should now voluntarily bring back his birth

to 1820: it would have been better to have adhered to «quieta non movere»[12]. Wright similarly confirms this first on 28th January 1863:

He now says that he was born in 1820, and was nineteen when he wrote the Codex Sinaiticus. This is in direct contradiction of his statement in the Cambridge University Library in October last. I asked him, through his interpreter, in what year he professed to have written the Codex, and how old he was at the time. The reply was, in the year 1839, when he was fifteen years old. Mr. Bradshaw, Fellow of King's College, was present at the time and heard it.

And on 11th February 1863. The occasion for the second letter is a reply to Simonides' comment on the first. In *Guardian* 4th February 1863 Simonides had given a characteristic explanation:

Mr. W. A. Wright is again in error in asserting that I stated at Cambridge that my age was fifteen years when I wrote the Codex. What my interpreter may have said I know not, who speaks very fluently many things which he knows about me, and also his own opinions, but I do know that I was never asked the question at all. The only mention of fifteen years in that conversation was in relation to the age of the modern MS. of Esdras, one of the three MSS. which I particularly consulted in writing the text and notes upon those books.

The errors which seem to arise on both sides from the necessity of an interpreter make me very sorry that there are not more gentlemen in England, among all those who profess to be acquainted with ancient Greek, who can understand me when I speak in that language. In Cambridge I only had the pleasure of meeting one such — viz., the Rev. W. M. Gunson, M. A., Professor of Greek in Christ's College, to whom, with the Rev. John Hays, M.A, and many other gentlemen, especially of this college, I was indebted for extremely kind, hospitable and courteous treatment, during my stay in Cambridge.

This is the letter Wright refers to in his reply of 11 February 1863:

Sir — Simonides is singularly unfortunate in the people whom he has about him. I am at a loss to know who is responsible for any of his assertions. If he speaks, his interpreter misinterprets him; if he writes, his words are mistranslated. There is a spectral character about every part of his evidence. Quote Simonides' words, oral or written, and instantly they either mean nothing, or the very opposite of what they appear to mean. In reply to the part of his, or his friend's, letter this week which refers to me, I have to remark.

1. That I give the most emphatic contradiction to Simonides' account of our interview at Cambridge. I asked him two separate questions, and his

12. For further letters by Tregelles on this topic see T.C.F. Stunt «Some Unpublished Letters of S.P. Tregelles Relating to the Codex Sinaiticus» Evangelical Quarterly XLVIII (1976) pp. 15-26.

interpreter, who was a Greek and spoke English perfectly, must have been strangely wanting in his duty if he misrepresented my questions or Simonides' answers. The questions were — When does Simonides say he wrote the Codex Sinaiticus? and, How old was he at the time? The answers were–In the year 1839, and, Fifteen. This latter fact was in accordance, be it observed, with two statements in the Life of Simonides by Mr. Stewart, which Simonides allowed Mr. Hodgkin to make use of without correction, and with the account of Simonides' age when in Cambridge last October, as stated by his interpreter to Mr. Bradshaw after referring to Simonides himself. What would be thought in a court of justice of the evidence of a witness who acquits himself in this manner? And yet we are expected to take Simonides' mere assertion that he wrote the Codex Sinaiticus.

2. Simonides asserts — «The only mention of fifteen years in that conversation was in relation to the age of the modern MS. of Esdras, one of three MSS. which I particularly consulted in writing the text and notes upon those books». To this I reply that not one word was said either to Mr. Bradshaw or to myself about the age of a modern MS. of Esdras. The whole paragraph is untrue from beginning to end.

Here, then, are two gross misrepresentations, to use no stronger term, of plain matters of fact. Here, at least, is no palaeographic mystery. How long will Simonides go on asking us to take his word?

W.A. Wright

Both letters appeared in *The Guardian.* A point from an earlier letter by Wright is commented on by L. Drakachis, who announces himself as a friend of Simonides. He was a medical student introduced to Simonides at J.E. Hodgkin's request by his uncle Dr. Thomas Hodgkin to act as an interpreter.

Sir — In your number of January 28 this year is a letter signed by Mr. W. A. Wright. In the first paragraph he states that Simonides' interpreter, in answer to his question relative to the age of Simonides when he wrote the Codex, said that Simonides was «fifteen years old».

I beg to observe that I am not the interpreter of Simonides, but am his friend, and would not trouble you with this, but as Mr. W. A. Wright took upon himself to make this same statement as to the age at the meeting of the Royal Society of Literature, when I was obliged to contradict him, and that rather strongly — that I never made such an assertion, neither from myself or from Simonides — I take this opportunity of stating the reasons why I could not have made such an assertion:

1. Because I had only a few days before drawn the attention of Simonides to this inaccuracy in Mr. Stewart's Memoir.

2. Because I had seen the certificate of Simonides' baptism, a copy of which I enclose you, signed first by the priest and two of the witnesses, then by the mayor, and secretary of the island of Symi, and lastly by the Vice-consul of Austria.

3. Because I knew from of my Greek friends the age of Simonides.

Under these circumstances, I should think that no person of candour can now have any doubt whatever on the point in question.

L. Drakachis

This letter appeared in *The Guardian,* 18th February, 1863, and was deemed to be of sufficient interest and importance that *The Journal of Sacred Literature* reprinted it in July 1863.

But even if he were only 15 in 1839 Simonides does not see that this causes any difficulty with his claim that he wrote Sinaiticus in 1839 — 40 as he wrote in *The Guardian, 21st January, 1863*:

> Still you wonder and say «How was it possible for a mere child, under fifteen years of age, to produce such a large MS.» (I was really nearly twenty years old.) I equally wonder at Hermogenes from Tarsus, who at fifteen composed his famous treatise on Rhetoric, which was justly admired by the rhetoricians older than he, and is still admired by all as a production of incomparable power. This Hermogenes at fifteen became the teacher of the great rhetoricians of his time. And yet I transcribed a prepared work, being nineteen years of age, while Hermogenes composed a very learned work, being younger than I. Further, I wonder at Sophocles, who, while a boy, vanquished his tragic master, Aeschylus, although at first instructed by him. I wonder equally at the painter, Raphael, who, while young, was able to ascend on the scale of art to a wonderful height of glory, to enter into the temple of immortality, and salute Apelles, Zeuxis and Pauselenus, and be enrolled in the assembly of the immortal painters of antiquity, leaving behind him works which may be justly considered divine. I wonder, also, that my own brother, Photius, younger than I, was able to distinguish himself in the graphic art, and to excel his senior schoolfellows so as to receive from the appointed judges the golden prize.
>
> But you need not such examples, for they abound in ancient and modern history.

However just to prove that he was not altering his birthdate after the criticisms of it published above were known, Hodgkin in a letter to *The Guardian,* 11th March 1863, tells us was aware of Stewart's error in the *Memoir* at the time that biography was written:

> Respecting the time of his birth, you have had sufficient evidence already from the baptismal register, that he was born in 1820, and not in 1824, as some persons assert with an underhand motive. And this point was noticed by him in writing to Mr. C. Stewart, in a subsequent letter dated the 4th (16th) January, 1860, at Manchester, wherein he stated that
>
> «I received the 100 copies of my biography, and exceedingly thank you; but am, nevertheless, much vexed at observing in it not a few slips. And first, about the marriage of my father and my own birth. For it was not my father that was married in 1823, but my father's sister Anna, who

also gave birth to my namesake, Constantine, in 1824. But my father was married in 1819, and I myself was born the 5th of November, 1820. And my brother Photius was born the 11th of November, 1824. And you have hence been betrayed into the not slight error of taking the birth of my brother (or of my cousin Constantine) for mine, and the marriage of my aunt for that of my father. And there are other similar errors which should be noticed in the errata».

This was written by Simonides at the time to Mr. C. Stewart. And the letter, which contains (besides the passage quoted) also the account of the writing the pseudo - Sinaitic Codex, is still in Mr. Stewart's possesion. And his receipt of it was acknowledged in a letter to Simonides, which the latter still preserves.

Also in the letter purporting to have been sent to Stewart in 1860 (but not released until *The Guardian* published it on 26th August, 1863) the following postscript occurs:

P. S. — I received with pleasure the hundred copies of my Biography, and I am much obliged for them, but I am very sorry to observe in it not a few errors, especially in connection with the marriage of my father, and my birth: for it was not my father who was married in 1823, but his sister Anna, whose son Constantine was born in 1824. My father was married in 1819, and I was born on the 5th of November, 1820: my brother Photius in 1824, on the 11th of November. So that you have committed the considerable error of making the birth of my brother precede my own, and the marriage of my aunt precede that of my father. There are other similar errors which it would be well to notice in a leaf of errata. — Thine, C. S.

Other evidence in favour of 1820 as the real date of birth is to be found in *The Gentleman's Magazine* October 1856, *Allgemeine Zeitung* (Augsburg) February 1856 and *The Homilist* April 1862.

d) Visit to Sinai.

In another matter, the *Biographical Memoir* (presumably the authorized version of Simonides' life in 1859) does not support the later story concerning Codex Sinaiticus. Tregelles (*The Guardian,* 11th February, 1863) points out that the *Memoir* leaves no room for a trip to Sinai in 1852. Simonides had said he visited St. Catherine's and saw «his» manuscript there then. In drawing our attention to this, Tregelles shows that there was an old antagonism between the two men:

But as Simonides sent me, in January, 1861, the Memoir by Mr. C. Stewart, to confute all that I had said about him in *Additions to Horne's Introduction* vol. iv. pp. 749 — 60: and as, at p. 32, Mr. Stewart says that «if any doubt should remain in the mind of the reader, the authority for every statement will be at once furnished» I am fully justified in treating this book as being what Simonides and his co - operators *wished to be believed.* It is strange that the Memoir not only does not mention the visit to Mount Sinai in 1852, but appears to leave no room for such a journey, unless indeed it lay on his route from Egypt to the Canary Isles by way of Algeria.

Once more Simonides is obliged to state that Stewart's *Memoir* is at fault. In *The Guardian,* 11th March, 1863, he writes:

> If you should meet with my *Autographs,* which were published in autograph in 1854 at Odessa by the monk Callinicus, you will read there the whole account of the family of the writer of the pseudo-Sinaitic Codex, and not only this, but that he was at Mount Sinai, not once but twice or thrice. And should you also peruse the remarks made in pp. 9 and 16 of the Appendix to No 1 of the Memoir, published at Munich in 1857, you will find further confirmation of the fact that Simonides was at Sinai in 1852. The same thing is established also by the *Four Theological Tracts* published by Simonides in London in 1858.

These other sources are not referred to again in the controversy. As an indication of the animosity created by this controversy, it is interesting to note that the editor of *The Guardian* in a footnote to this letter of Simonides states:

> «We cannot spare room for irrelevant, and still less for libellous, matter, and have therefore omitted two paragraphs of this letter — one containing imputations against a Greek priest, who bore testimony adverse to Simonides; the other professing to answer Dr. Tregelles by simply accusing him of ignorance»

(e) Codex Friderico Augustanus

This visit by Simonides to the monastery in 1852 raised a bigger issue, as Wright pointed out in a letter to *The Parthenon* on 24th January, 1863. Comparing Tischendorf's story with Simonides' he notes:

> Tischendorf not only professes to have seen the manuscript in 1844, but to have brought part of it to Europe, which he deposited in the Leipsig University library, and published in facsimile in 1846. As Simonides says he saw the manuscript entire in 1852, you will perceive that this considerably increases the difficulty of believing his story. We have, therefore, in this case something more than «conflicting statements».

The Codex Friderico-Augustanus (identified as originally part of Codex Sinaiticus) was published by Tischendorf in 1846. *The Christian Remebrancer,* April 1863, questions Simonides' silence again on this matter:

> The Codex Friderico-Augustanus is part and parcel of the Codex Sinaiticus. It was published in 1846. Why was Dr. Simonides silent about its real authorship till the Codex Sinaiticus became known, in 1860?

In its next issue (July, 1863), this quarterly refers to the problem again — this time more caustically.

> Simonides made no mention of Cod. Friderico-Augustanus, which had been published for sixteen years, and which, being an integral part of the larger MS., must have been written by his hands if the other was. It seemed, at first sight, difficult to imagine that he was not aware of the existence of a volume which had made a great impression on Biblical students, the rather as he might have seen the original leaves when at Leipsic, in

1856; yet nothing but such complete ignorance (not so very surprising, we may remark in passing, to any one that had read the Introduction and Notes to his *Facsimiles* of the Mayer Papyri) could account for his absolute silence.

Scrivener's *Full Collation* p. lxiv states likewise, that if Simonides recognised his own work from the facsimile of ℵ in Tischendorf's *Notitia* why did not put forward the same claim to be the author of Codex Friderico-Augustanus especially as he had the opportunity of seeing those leaves when he was in Leipzig in 1856. Simonides' case requires him to state why between 1846 and 1862 he had not denounced Codex Friderico-Augustanus as a modern work in the same terms as he had denounced Sinaiticus.

Even if Simonides had never seen the manuscript in Leipzig, his archdefender J.E. Hodgkin in a letter in *The Guardian,* 14th January, 1863, states that Simonides has seen and studied Codex Friderico-Augustanus almost two years previously in Hodgkin's house in Liverpool, fully recognising it to be from «his» Codex.

Not surprisingly Wright made much of this objection. In a letter to *The Guardian,* 10th December, 1862 he argued that Simonides only heard of Codex Friderico-Augustanus when a facsimile was exhibited on October 7th 1862 in the British Archaeological Association meeting in Cambridge at which Simonides had been present. Giving more details later (letter to *The Guardian,* 21st January, 1863) Wright sets out the issues:

> Before the 7th October, 1862, Simonides was unacquainted with the Codex Friderico-Augustanus, which is known to be a part of the same MS. as the Codex Sinaiticus.
>
> 1. On the 7th October, 1862, Simonides came into the Cambridge University Library. The *facsimile* of the Codex Friderico-Augustanus was put before him. Every one who is acquainted with that MS. knows that at the end of 2 Esdras, and again at the end of Esther, is a note to the effect that it had been compared with the extremely ancient copy corrected by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphilus. Simonides was asked, «Have you at Mount Athos the very copy which Pamphilus himself corrected»? He was unable to answer at the time, but came next day with a lame story that they had, not the original of Pamphilus, but a copy.
>
> 2. He was asked, «How is it, if your MS. was deposited at Mount Sinai in 1841, that within two years and a half — that is, by May, 1844 — it was found in the mutilated condition described by Tischendorf». This he could not explain.
>
> 3. Simonides, in his letter to the *Guardian* of the 3rd of September, 1862, claims to have seen his own MS. again in 1852. He simply says it was «much altered, having an older appearance than it ought to have». In 1840 he had it newly bound. In 1844 it was entirely disintegrated, every vestige of binding had disappeared, and large portions of the MS. were lost. Had

he seen the MS. in 1852, he could not have described its condition as he has done.

For these reasons I came to the conclusion, which was shared by others, that at the time Simonides was in Cambridge, and certainly at the time he wrote his first letter to the *Guardian* he was not aware that so long ago as 1844 Tischendorf had brought a portion of the same MS. to Europe and published it in 1846 as the Codex Friderico-Augustanus. I submit to you, Sir, that my inference was not «maliciously ingenious», but natural and legitimate. It now appears that so long ago as the spring of 1861, Simonides had «seen and studied» the Codex Friderico – Augustanus at Mr. Hodgkin's own house. This does not make the case of Simonides any better. If, so long ago as the spring of 1861, he had seen and studied the Codex Friderico-Augustanus, how is it that it was not till the autumn of the following year that he put forth his claim to be the scribe? I infer that he could not have known the Codex Frid. – Aug. and the Codex Sinaiticus to have been one and the same MS. If he had written the Codex Friderico – Augustanus, he must have recognised it. If he did not recognise it, the inference is that he did not write it. If he both wrote it and recognised it, it is inconceivable that he should have maintained a profound silence regarding it for a year and a half. My inferences are the natural result of Simonides' own conduct in the matter. Tischendorf asks, «Why did not Simonides, who was in Leipsig in 1856, then and there recognise as his own work the Codex Frid.-Aug., which is in the University Library? He answers his own question, «Because he would have been put into the nearest madhouse».

Given the cut and thrust of this controversy, it is not surprising that this letter provoked a reply. The replies to points two and three in Wright's letter will be dealt with later (below, section f). As far as point one is concerned it is J.E. Hodgkin who jumps to Simonides' defence again in a letter to *The Guardian,* 28th January, 1863:

> Sir — The letter of Mr. W. A. Wright in the *Guardian* of this week offers many temptations to the retort courteous, which, however, I mean to resist, and merely reply to one or two of his statements. The first two relate to a conversation carried on through an interpreter, and of which Simonides gives an account differing from that of Mr. Wright. He stated at Cambridge that the entire note at the end of Esdras was taken from a comparatively recent Codex on paper, preserved at Mount Athos, which was probably a copy from some earlier MS. He now further states that it was inserted there as a memorandum or reference to a Codex which, though not valuable on account of its age, contained some good readings, and that a great number of the notes in both the Codex Friderico – Augustanus and Codex Sinaiticus will also be found on investigation to have been written as memoranda for alterations in a subsequent Codex... the identity of the

Codex Sinaiticus with the Codex Friderico – Augustanus was well known to him, and had often been commented on by him long before he sent his letter to the *Guardian, any omission of the description of its imperfect state in that was not owing to his ignorance of this identity.*

And Wright replies (*Guardian,* 4th February 1863):

> Sir — The following is the note at the end of Esdras in the Codex Friderico-Augustanus to which Mr. Hodgkin refers. I give the Greek that Simonides may not accuse me of mistranslating: — Αντεβληθη προς παλαιωτατον λιαν αντιγραφον δεδιορθωμενον χειρι του αγιου μαρτυρος Παμφιλου· οπερ αντιγραφον προς τω τελει υποσημειωσις τις ιδιοχειρος αυτου υπεκειτο εχουσα ουτως· μετελημφθη και διορθωθη προς τα εξαπλα ωριγενους αντωνινος αντιβαλεν· παμφιλος διορθωσα. English,«Collated with an extremely ancient copy corrected by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphilus: with regard to which there was attached at the end of a subscription in his own handwriting, running thus,'«Altered and corrected by the Hexapla of Origen; Antoninus collated, I Pamphilus corrected»». A similar note, containing more details, is found at the end of Esther in the same Codex. It adds the fact that the copy corrected by Pamphilus began with I Kings (i.e.. 1 Samuel according to us) and ended with Esther. The natural and obvious meaning of the note is that the writer of it, who is not the original scribe, had collated the portion just mentioned with the copy of Pamphilus, the readings from which he inserted in the margin. Simonides says — «The entire note at the end of Esdras was taken from a comparatively recent Codex on paper preserved at Mount Athos which was probably a copy from some earlier MS». He further states that it was inserted there as a memorandum or reference to a Codex which, though not valuable on account of its age, contained some good readings. I leave your readers to judge whether of these explanations is the true one. If Simonides inserted the note, it contains a statementwhich is untrue. If he did not insert it, his story falls to the ground.

Simonides' own weak words on this matter come in a letter in *The Guardian,* 21th January, 1863:

> If you understand the twofold significance of the note which exists at the end of the fourth column of the eighth page of the pseudo – Friderico – Augustine Codex, you would repent of what both you and your patrons have stirred up against me inconsiderately.

(f) Mutilation of the manuscript

Arising from the preceding — and in fact parts 2 and 3 in Wright's letter above — is the problem of the mutilation of Codex Sinaiticus. Let us recapitulate: the mutilation of the manuscript seems to have occurred between 1841 when Simonides tells us it was deposited in St. Catherine's and 1844 when Tischendorf says he found the Codex Friderico-Augustanus in a poor state. In his original letter *(The Guardian,* 3rd September, 1862) Simonides merely says that when he was in

Sinai in 1852 his manuscript was «much altered». *The Clerical Journal* in its issue 11th September 1862 is very scathing about Simonides' explanation of what he was in 1852.

> In 1844, Dr. Tischendorf procured the Friderico - Augustan fragments, which are, we believe, indentified as part of this Codex Sinaiticus; yet, in 1844, the volume could not have been more than three years old, and could only just have reached the monastery. Again, in 1845 or 1846, a Russian Archimandrite, named Porphyrius, seems unquestionably to have stumbled upon the Sinai MS. But Simonides affirms that he saw the volume (not fragments of it), at Sinai in 1852. It is certain that in 1859 Tischendorf found what remained wrapped up in a rag. So that there is no possible way of reconciling the story of Simonides, either with probability, or with what others say they saw. Leaving out of view the dates and facts of 1844, 1845, and 1846, it seems that seven short years were sufficient for the mutilation of this splendid MS., and for its partial destruction, as well as for its transformation into a book which the first scholars in Europe say bears all the marks of an antiquity of fourteen hundred and fifty to fifteen hundred years. If there was a miracle in its production, there is heap of miracles in its subsequent history. It was written, corrected, perused with attention, etc., in the course of a few months; was sent to Sinai, where in a few months more its origin was forgotten; it was in fragments in 1844, 1845, and 1846, but complete (except the dedication) in 1852, and in 1859 was found a wreck wrapped in a rag. If Dr. Simonides has no better tale to tell than the one which we have analyzed. our faith has nothing to fear, and the Codex Sinaiticus will retain its proud pre-eminence.

Scrivener, *Full Collation* lxf, also points out that in 1845 or 1846 Porphyry, to whom we referred earlier[13] examined the manuscript and «published a tolerable account of its contents and the character of its text at St. Petersburg in 1856». Another witness of the manuscript around this time was an Englishman, Major Macdonald, who saw the manuscript and was told by the monks (following Tischendorf) that it was fourth century. Macdonald's description of the state of the manuscript tallies with Tischendorf's.

In contradiction to Tischendorf and those who claimed the manuscript had been mutilated, Simonides (in a letter to *The Literary Churchman,* 2nd February, 1863) wrote of an earlier, hitherto unknown visit to Sinai in 1844:

> Dear Sir, — Tischendorf speaks falsely if he says that he did not see the Pentateuch, for the Old and New Testaments were all contained in one volume. I saw them in safe preservation when I was at the monastery in March, 1844, a little before Tischendorf's arrival. And, when I was there a second time (in 1852), I again saw my MS., but uncared for, and altered and lacking a part, and full of marks, unskillfully written by a later hand; and the dedication to the Emperor Nicholas was also missing. But the Pen-

13. Chapter I p. 22.

tateuch was still there — all right; the proof of which is, that I took a tracing from it, of four pages, containing the acrostichs, two of which I showed to yourself, before Dr. Drakakes, and Callinikos saw it, who remarked the acrostichs in his letter to me. Tischendorf, in denying this, conceals an artful purpose; perhaps he intends, in some third happy visit, another «discovery» which he may present to Queen Victoria, or the Emperor of the French.

In his first story we were told by Simonides that in 1846 he learned of the dispatch of the manuscript to Sinai. «The inference is obvious that when he wrote his original narrative he did not know of Tischendorf's first find of the leaves, and thus he invented his own visit in 1844... to bridge the gap in his story» states the British Museum pamphlet *The Mount Sinai Manuscript of the Bible* 1934 p. 13.

Hodgkin however believes Simonides and refers to this earlier visit while answering Wright's second point (p. 48). Forever defending Simonides, Hodgkin again blames mistranslation:

> In reply to Mr. Wright's second statement, Simonides simply says that the description given by Tischendorf is incorrect, and that he knows that the MS. was not in 1844 in the dilapidated condition described by that gentleman.
>
> Here we have two contradictory accounts, upon the truth of neither of which we seem to have the materials to decide. In reply to Mr. Wright's complaint of the inaccuracy of Simonides description of the state in which he found the MS. in 1852, I may state that his letter to the *Guardian* was very incorrectly translated, and that this paragraph does not give the full sense of the original.
>
> (*The Guardian,* 28th January, 1863)

The indefatigable W. A. Wright returns to these points in a letter to *The Guardian,* 4th February, 1863 (and repeated in *The Journal of Sacred Literature,* July 1863):

> Mr. Hodgkin says Simonides gives an account of our interview at Cambridge differing from mine. I have a perfect recollection of all that took place, and am ready to attest the truth of my version...
>
> In reply to my second statement, «Simonides simply says that the description given by Tischendorf is incorrect, and that he knows that the MS. was not in 1844 in the dilapidated condition described by that gentleman». This is a very easy way of getting rid of a difficulty. I prefer to believe in the truth of Tischendorf's statement, and would class that of Simonides with his new account of his age, which Mr. Hodgkin sets down as an inadvertence. Simonides now says that Tischendorf has the whole MS. in his possession and that he intends to go the East and make another find, when he will ask Victoria or the Emperor of the French to patronise him. Why then, did he leave so much of it behind in 1844. I should think Simonides'own friends must begin to open their eyes at last; but none are so blind as those who will not see.

(g) The Librarian

A minor point involving Simonides' visit to St. Catherine's in 1852 is raised by *The Clerical Journal* on 11th October, 1862 (and repeated in *The Journal of Sacred Literature,* October 1862) and concerns not only the strange silence of the librarian about the manuscript's provenance and its condition but also the removal of the dedication:

> In 1846 Simonides says he went again to Constantinople, where the patriarch told him he «had some time previously sent» the manuscript to Sinai. This fairly implies that it had not been long sent. In 1852, Simonides saw the MS. at Sinai, but the librarian, when asked how they got it, did not seem to know anything of the matter; «and I, for my part, said nothing» adds Dr. Simonides. We add the question, Who will believe this? or, if it be true, Why was the librarian ignorant and left in ignorance? More than this: the MS. was much altered, and had an older appearance than it ought to have, and the dedication to Nicholas had been removed. The dedication, therefore, had been written, and yet we are assured that the work was to have been rewritten, although so carefully executed and upon so valuable a material.

(h) The exemplars

Even among those willing to give credence to Simonides' story, many questions inevitably came to mind. For instance many were curious about the manuscripts Simonides had used in the preparation of Codex Sinaiticus. Where, for instance, are the original documents from which Simonides made his transcripts? Where are the manuscripts? What were the materials from which Benedict framed his presentation?

As we have seen, Tischendorf in his letter to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of December 1862 status that ℵ differs in «many thousand places from all the Moscow editions and from all manuscripts written in the last thousand years».

The British Museum pamphlet *Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus* states that «neither the Moscow edition nor the Athos Manuscripts (referred to by Simonides) have ever been identified nor could a combination with the Codex Alexandrinus have produced anything resembling the text of the Sinaiticus». The very uniqueness of Sinaiticus is against its being produced from other (known) manuscripts.

Scrivener, *Full Collation* p. lxxi is also sceptical about Simonides' claim to have produced Sinaiticus from manuscripts available to him at Mount Athos: «About the character of his three manuscripts met at Athos he (Simonides) is silent, but nothing has ever been brought from the Holy Mountain, which much exceeds a thousand years old». Similarly Scrivener writes «No one who in his (Benedict's) time (1839) sat down to construct an ancient text which should resemble that of the earliest manuscripts, versions, and ecclesiastical writers, could possibly have been led to the results embodied in the Codex Sinaiticus».

The inclusion of the apocryphal writings in ℵ causes *The Christian Remembrancer,* April 1863, to ask

> Can Dr. Simonides explain why the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas appear in his uncle's edition, as if they were part of the *New Testament?* The photo-lithographed plate represents the Epistle of Barnabas commencing in the very next column to that in which the Apocalypse ends, just as S. Luke follows S. Mark. Such an arrangement might have been not unusual in the centuries when the Canon of the New Testament was not fixed by common consent among the churches. A case exactly in point occurs in our own Alexandrine MS., where the two epistles called Κλημεντος α, and Κλημεντος β, are found expressly mentioned, in the catalogue, as part of the New Testament. But what editor of the New Testament, in the present day, would think of putting forth an edition with the epistles of Barnabas and Clement to appear as a part of the sacred text? The Moscow edition of the New Testament ends with the Apocalypse.

Scrivener[14] also poses a question: Why if Simonides had a genuine fragment of Hermas in Greek in 1855 which Tischendorf used in his edition of the Apostolic Fathers did he state that he copied Hermas in 1840 from old copies on Mount Athos. To these questions Simonides is strangely silent.

Some of the above points listed as (a) — (h) are summarised by Hodgkin in *The Guardian* on 26th August 1863 (and *The Literary Churchman,* lst September, 1863) as an indication of the current position held by Simonides' opponents:

> 1. The age of Simonides was only fifteen when he undertook the task of writing the Codex as a present to the Emperor Nicholas. 2. If his birth really took place in 1820, it would have been easy for him to correct the error in Mr. Stewart's Memoir. 3. It is extremely improbable that one who had yet to acquire the very rudiments of the art should be able to produce a work from which the professional calligrapher shrank. 4. The account given by Simonides of the state in which he found the MS. after Tischendorf's first visit does not agree with the dilapidated condition in which it must have been if a portion, represented by the Codex Frid. Augustanus, had been already abstracted. (I purposely omit the consideration of the absence of the portion *preceding* this, because we have no *proof* that these leaves were not in the volume in 1852). 5. The text of the Codex Sinaiticus is one which could not have been produced by the simple collation of the Moscow edition with ancient codices at Mount Sinai, «as it differs from the Moscow editions in many thousand places and from all the MSS». And Simonides' thousand years: while it stands in some instances alone, and in others has for its companion only the *Vatican* and *Cambridge* MSS. «And Simonides statement in the *Guardian* of January 21, explaining how the text had been formed, was made *after* the preceding objections had been raised and «it was

14. op. cit. p. xvii

obvious, of course, to every impartial reader, that these counterstatements and explanations came some months too late».

This summary leads Hodgkin to introduce the allegedly earlier letter in which Simonides' counter-statements and explanations precede the objections that were made to the 1862 letter. This is how Hodgkin present the letter of 1860:

> Fortunately for Simonides, his letter to Mr. Stewart, *written on the 4th (16th) of January,* 1860, long before the world knew much about the peculiarities of the text of the Codex Sinaiticus, is in existence. I am much mistaken if it does not contain in itself the answer to the objections recited above, and I deeply regret that a *literal* translation of it was not published at the time it was received. Instead of this, a sort of paraphrase was made, which was afterwards interwoven with other matter, and formed the letter of Sept. 3d, 1862. I saw the letter for the first time three or four weeks ago, when it was intrusted to me by Mr. Stewart, and feeling how much the real question of the antiquity of the Codex has been complicated by the inefficient way in which the Greek of Simonides has in this case been rendered into English I determined to send you a transcript of the original accompanied, for convenient reference, by the most literal English version I could give.

This letter as well as repeating the story told in the letter of 1862 adds to it. *The Guardian* italicizes those portions of the letter which were absent (or misunderstood or mistranslated) in that earlier letter. They include the following:

Concerning Simonides' visit to St. Catherine's in 1852

I. In 1844 I was again at Constantinople, and went to the island of Antigonus to see the Patriarch Constantius, and give him an important packet of MSS. I was received with his usual courtesy, and in the course of conversation I asked about my transcript of the Scriptures. He replied, «Long ago, my son, I sent thy valuable work to Sinai». And twice have I seen it myself in the Library of Sinai, first in 1844 and then in 1852. I asked the librarians how and whence the Library had obtained it. They having nothing to say (neither the first nor the second knowing anything about it), were silent, and I said nothing to them *about the transcription;* but taking it in my hands found it somewhat altered in form, both externally and internally, *for it had an older appearance than it ought to have had, and the MS. was defective in part. As I remembered the dedication to the Emperor Nicholas (which I had prefixed to the book in golden characters), and found that it had been taken out, I smiled, and replaced the book in its original place,* and commenced my philological investigations (for there were in that library many very valuable MSS), and pursuing them with diligence I discovered many things of great importance, among which the most important were all the pastoral writings of Hermas, and the Holy Gospel according to St. Mat-

thew, and the disputed epistle of Aristeas to Philocrates (as I have elsewhere remarked), all written upon Egyptian papyrus, principally in the first century, together with some other important MSS, *which I described in a letter to Constantius*, as also to my spiritual father Callistratus, Archbishop of Libya, on my return to Alexandria.

2. *Dionysius, the professional calligrapher of the monastery, was requested to undertake the work, but he declined, saying that he could not accomplish the task assigned to him, which he considered very difficult and quite beyond his capabilities.*

When he objected to perform what had been allotted to him, for the reasons which he gave, I myself yielded to the entreaties of my venerable uncle and undertook the performance of the work, for I had been proved and approved in time past, and my hand was very well practised from childhood in the ancient writing.

And so we straightway inspected the oldest MSS. preserved in Mount Athos of the sacred writings referred to.

I for my part carefully considered the questions connected with the best possible performance of the penmanship. And the learned Benedict taking in his hands a copy of the Moscow edition of the Old and New Testament (published at the expense of the illustrious brothers Zosimas, and by them presented to the Greeks), collated it, with my assistance, with three only of the ancient copies, which he had long before annotated and corrected for another purpose and cleared their text by this collation from remarkable clerical errors, and again collated them with the edition of the Codex Alexandrinus, printed with uncial letters, and still further with another very old Syriac Codex; and gave me, in the first instance, Genesis to copy.

This «1860» letter clearly shows that Simonides tried to cover up some of the elements in the original (i. e. 1862) story by producing this «earlier draft» through his champion Hodgkin.

Now to continue with our list of objections to Simonides' story — be it of 1860 or 1862.

(i) Physical Effort

As well as the problems involved in producing a text in 1839 with readings such as are found in ℵ, there are the physical difficulties of accomplishing the task Simonides claims he achieved, first of a personal nature. Even those sympathetic to Simonides were amazed at his productivity.

The Journal of Sacred Literature in an amusing report of a meeting of the Royal Society of Literature held on 11th February 1863, makes the following calculation in its April issue 1863:

Simonides had asserted in a letter to the *Guardian*, and in a similar letter to the *Literary Churchman*, that he wrote the Sinaitic Codex on 1206

pages in *eight months.* But at the close of the meeting in question, he affirmed, through his interpreter and to the writer of this paper, that he had nowhere published any such statement, but that he had stated *twenty* months. This is what we call prevarication, to use the mildest term. If he had written the 1206 pages in the eight months as he said, and we allow him two hundred working days in that time, he must have written six pages daily. Some of the pages have two columns, and others four, but altogether there would be about 4,500 columns of forty – eight lines each. The number of lines would be about 216,000, or more than one thousand lines of uncial writing per day. The total number of letters would be considerably over 3,000,000, reckoning the lines as all of fourteen letters each, which is the case with the short lines only of four columns to the page. We may safely say that in reality there must be 4,000,000 of letters — all uncials — for the 200 days, or 20,000 a day. If six hours a day are given for work, we have 3333 for every hour, and about fifty – five for every minute. As every letter is separately formed, and, except I, requires two, three, and four movements or strokes of the pen, it will be seen that not less than 120 strokes must have been every minute. Finally, we have compared the avowed uncials of Simonides with some of the *fac – similes* in Dr. Tischendorf's edition, and we venture to say very decidedly that the letters are not all formed by the same kind of stroke or movement of the hand.

The Clerical Journal makes much of this in its critical leading article on 11th September 1862.

> Simonides examined the principal copies of the Scriptures at Mount Athos, and «began to practise the principles of calligraphy». His uncle Benedict furnished him with a printed text, which he had collated with the ancient ones and corrected. We are not told how long these preliminaries took, but it must have been some time. Deliberations and decisions, the art of calligraphy, and the collation and correction of a Bible, in a case like this, must have occupied a good many months — a year would be little enough, especially when we remember that in preparing the text or «copy» the old spelling would have to be introduced as well as the vanations of reading.... The preliminaries, the execution, and the history of the work thus far extend over some twenty months. Now the fragment of the manuscript found by Tischendorf contains three hundred and forty-five leaves and a half, folio size, four columns to a page, and written in the exquisitely formed uncials of the early ages. When complete, the volume must have contained from eleven hundred to twelve hundred pages... If the statements are true, the production of the work was a modern miracle. Twenty short months never saw so much accomplished by one individual since the art of writing was invented. We simply do not believe the accuracy for the narrative, and repeat our conviction that the writer suffers from some unusual hallucination.

Simonides defends his abilities in a letter to *The Guardian* on 21st January, 1863:

> You adduce to us the shortness of the time as a forcible argument, saying that it is wholly impossible for any one to copy in a few months the whole pseudo-Sinaitic Codex. I admit that, according to your judgment, it may be so, but according to mine, I who am called Daedalus by some of the journals, it is quite possible, and by no means laborious; for I could write five pages of this pseudo-Sinaitic Codex daily, and in the space of ten months I will give you 1,500 pages. I know that I wrote 1,205 pages in eight months and ceased from the work only because the skins failed. If you doubt this «Lo, here is Rhodes, here is the leap» according to the proverb. Deposit £10,000 sterling in my name in the Bank of England and I will write again this same work in your presence, and in presence of your friends in the same space of time. Then take the manuscript and let me take the money; but if I fail, which is impossible, I will give you such an ancient MS. as you choose from those which I possess[15].
>
> Knowing this, I say to you again that the MS. of the Sacred Scriptures taken from Mount Sinai by Tischendorf, is my production, and by no means ancient.
>
> The Codex proclaims this itself, as shall be afterwards shown when my proofs will speak for themselves. Words are therefore needless.
>
> Truly I wonder how people can credit such unreasonable falsehoods, things wholly impossible, and believe the reports of Tischendorf — viz., that I prepared palimpsests, and wrote 10,000 pages of an Egyptian Lexicon, 7,000 pages of the Alexandrine Philological Catalogue, 10,000 pages of Uranius! 8,800,000 pages of various other ancient - writers on different subjects! That I corrected the corrupted texts of various classical writers, filled up many blanks of injured ancient MSS., and wrote and prepared papyri! And all this in a very limited space of time, for which work a life of two thousand years would not suffice me, had I two thousand hands, and one thousand heads. Yet they consider it a wonder to have made a simple copy of a manuscript of the Old and New Testaments, done by me in my juvenile years. O wonder of wonders!

And also in the following issue:

> I was also called the golden calligraphic pen, because I transcribed the rules of the college at Aegina in golden letters, and ornamented them with some devices. I also wrote calligraphic exercises for the instruction of my college companions; not only this, but on the death of Charilaos, our teacher of calligraphy, I succeeded him with the approbation of the directors of the college, although still very young. I also transcribed the Olynthiacs of Demosthenes in ancient characters, and declaimed them successfully at the

15. Reaction to this is given below p. 70.

public examinations, for which I was designated Demosthenic Rhyme, by Philetairos, Professor of Literature. I was also called Euclid's Compasses by Rhega, Professor of Mathematics, an embodied Genius by my uncle, an extraordinary Phenomenon by the Patriarch Constantius, Cheirographodephet by the Editors of the *Telegraph of the Bosphorus,* Chalkenteros by the *Messenger of the Byzantines,* Indefatigable mind and pen by my companions, Lynceus by Dindorf, Hand of Daedalus by the Editors of the *Athena,* published at Athens, and by many others of whom it is needless to speak at present. Alexander v. Humboldt named me «a living enigma and indissoluble Gordian knot» as C. Stewart, the journals the *Dial,* January 17, 1862, and *Bath Chronicle,* March 13, 1862, report.

Some other critics wondered why the professional calligrapher in the monastery, Dionysius, had not undertaken the work for Benedict. Thus *The Clerical Journal* of 11th October, 1862:

> It appears that Dionysius, «the professional calligrapher of the monastery» declined to undertake the work on account of its difficulty. Had Simonides told us its magnitude, we could have realized the fact, but surely a «professional calligrapher» ought to have found no difficulty if the texts were at hand. What this expert declined a novice attempted.

Simonides also replies to this aspect of the story in the letter to *The Guardian* on 21st January 1863:

> I undertook this work, then, not as a tyro, but as one versed in the ancient writting: for before this work, as I have mentioned above, I had written the Olynthiacs of Demosthenes in ancient characters, and had copied at twelve years of age the ancient inscriptions in the Aegina collection, besides four of the services at Mount Athos in 1837 in golden letters, ancient and modern, as well as the service of St. Pantaleon in golden characters. These services, especially the professional calligraphist of the monastery, Dionysius, could not imitate completely, for he was a copyist but not an archaiographer, and therefore could not execute other writing but what he had been taught from boyhood, round and clear penmanship. He was moreover, unacquainted with the ancient Greek language, and altogether ignorant of ornamentation, on which account I often wrote the ornamental work, titles and capital letters of works which he transcribed, for which he usually styled me Chrysographer, so that this good Dionysius had simply the work of transcribing the ecclesiastical books — for at Athos they generally appreciate written books more than the printed copies which come from foreign parts—but he knew not calligraphy properly although taught from childhood. And although I had a peculiar inclination for it, as well as for all the fine arts, I never became a professional calligraphist, because I had always more important and independent occupations in hand. But I was compelled to undertake this work — first, to gratify my uncle; secondly, as no one was there at hand at Athos to execute it; and thirdly, which was the most important to me, in the hope of obtaining the

present of a printing - press. To these motives may be added my youthful ambition to become first of all at Mount Athos in the profession of calligraphy, which actually came to pass.

On account of all these circumstances I undertook the work, and began immediately after the resignation of Dionysius to study the principles of calligraphy as much as was needed.

But even allowing Simonides the strength and ability to copy so much, the short time to achieve this work is the reason for Wright's first point in his first letter on the Sinaiticus controversy in *The Guardian* of 5th November, 1862:

I shall content myself for the present with examining the statement of Simonides up to this point. I find, on referring to *A Biographical Memoir of Constantine Simonides, &c., by Charles Stewart,* published in 1859, circulated by Simonides himself, and therefore, I presume, authentic, — that his uncle Benedict died on the 29th of August, 1840 (p. 8). Simonides reached Mount Athos from the Peiraeus in November, 1839. So that between the end of 1839 and the death of Benedict in August, 1840, we have the following extraordinary series of events. The scheme of a present to the Emperor of Russia devised, and its nature resolved on. Simonides, a boy barely fifteen years old, undertakes a task which was declined by the professional calligrapher to the monastery on account of its extreme difficulty. To prepare himself for it he begins to practise the principles of calligraphy. All this while Benedict is engaged in collating a copy of the Old and New Testaments with the MSS. in the monastery, and those who are at all experienced in collation know well that this was a work which must have occupied a considerable time. But in spite of this — in spite of the youth and inexperience of the copyist, who, by his own confession, had to acquire the very rudiments of his art in order to qualify himself for a task from which an experienced calligrapher shrank — the work proceeded so rapidly that by the time of Benedict's death in August it was well-nigh completed, and had already received his conections. I submit to you, Sir, that such a story carries on the face of it a high degree of improbability.

As in other issues such as Simonides' age in 1839 the *Memoir* acts as a stumbling - block to Simonides. As well as these human physical difficulties there are other physical problems regarding the nature of the writing material and ink.
concerned

As far as the vellum is concerned the editorial in *The Clerical Journal* of 11th September, 1862, comments on the unlikelihood that Simonides was able to acquire sufficient vellum for executing the work.

Dr. Simonides says he found in the library a large volume in ancient binding, almost blank, consisting of beautifully dressed and remarkably clean parchment. This book was inscribed Εκλογιον Πανηγυρικον, and contained one short discourse, much injured by time, and occupying one leaf. The scribe prepared his book by taking out the written leaf and «several others injured by time and moths». We admit that this may be

possibly correct, but it is very unlikely that a volume so bound, «remarkably clean», and «beautifully dressed» should contain one written leaf and a few others much injured by time and moths. Time and moths are very eccentric, we know, but seldom so much as to destroy part of a volume, the rest of which has been left clean enough and beautiful enough to form materials for a new volume to be presented to an emperor.

The Christian Remembrancer, April 1863 is also dubious:

We would next ask, Were the blank parchment-leaves on which Dr. Simonides states he wrote this MS., previously arranged in quaternions, or did he so arrange them. If so, how came the quaternions, originally written in red ink at the top of the page, to disappear. And when did he write the present numbers of the quaternions at the right-hand top-corners of the pages. And how does he account for the difference of numbering in the old and new quaternions already mentioned. If the manuscript be his manufacture, this is a matter which he can in a moment explain. Again, why was the page - title in the Revelation, which in the earlier pages was αποκαλυψις, altered in the later pages to αποκαλυψεις?

A telling and amusing point against Simonides is contained in a further question in this article:

Are the worm-eaten holes *through* the letters, or do the letters *avoid* the holes.

Simonides defends himself against these accusations in a letter to *The Guardian* on 21st January, 1863:

I learned the art of preparing suitable materials for writing — the proper ink, the making of bone pens, the polishing of the skins, the cleaning by chemicals of a few leaves soiled by time, the careful and proper division of the columns, the adoption of the style of writing, and such other things as are proper to archaeography. All these things belong to the graphic art.

And also in the following issue:

I was taught the means of knowing the ancient MSS. of every period and of every nature of their changes from time, also the knowledge of the skins, and the chemical preparation of the different writing — inks and the effects of the atmospheric changes of the different climates of the world. Further, I acquired the knowledge of the preparation of the skins of every city of the ancient nations, and such other information as is requisite with regard to the indisputable evidence both of the spuriousness and genuiness of MSS. of every kind; which information it is to be regretted is not possessed by any of the archaeologists and palaeographers of our day, as I was sufficiently assured by many circumstances, first and last, and more especially lately when the pseudo Sinaitic Codex appeared.

As well as acquiring sufficient vellum of quality and antiquity which could be given to the Czar, Simonides must have had ink old enough for Tischendorf to be led into thinking it was fourteen centuries older than it was in fact. *The Clerical Journal* picks up this point in the article on 11.9.1862:

Be it observed, he does not say one word about the ink. Yet those who have studied the MS. regard it as supplying an unquestioned argument for high antiquity. His reasons for other peculiarities of the volume are such as no critic will admit.

And *The Christian Remembrancer* of April 1863 comments:

As to the ink or inks: — So acccomplished a τεχνίτης καλλιγράφος may possibly have a small basket of differently tinted inks, as we sometimes see a small basket containing different kinds of fish-sauce handed round at dinner: and such an apparatus would be most convenient, or indeed nesessary, if the object was to *forge* a MS. resembling an old one: but what purpose could these inks of varied hue answer, when the object was simply to transcribe the edition of a learned and revered uncle and that to lay before the feet of an Emperor?

(j) Appearance of Sinaiticus

Continuing the objections raised about the actual appearance of the manuscript, the following appeared in *The Christian Remembrancer,* April 1863:

Professor Tischendorf states that there are many letters in the marginal notes which have been lost, from their having been written close up to the edge, and from the further circumstance of the edges having suffered injury. Now this is a thing which is extremely likely to happen with a MS. some centuries old, but is it likely to be the case with a MS. written on parchment (or vellum), and not much more than twenty years old? We assume that Professor Tischendorf's statement is correct, for the point is one upon which he could hardly be deceived; if his statement be not correct, then, indeed, his authority can go for very little.

The Clerical Journal, October 1862, makes a similar point and also draws attetnion to the style of writing:

We cannot turn from this topic without a word for the encouragement of those who are not skilled in old Biblical manuscripts. They might say, if the Codex Sinaiticus is by any possibility a modern production, the same may be true of other manuscripts which pass for the most ancient. Our friends may be reassured: there are features in these most venerable copies of the Holy Scriptures which cannot be imitated. A skilful man, by long practice, and with a certain knowledge of chemistry, could imitate the characters and appearance of many manuscripts on paper, and of some on vellum. But there is a limit to these things, and detection is almost inevitable. The action of ink upon vellum is peculiar, slow, and gradual, and leads to results which can be measured by time. The action of light and air, and warmth, and moisture, are also remarkably uniform. The style of writing peculiar to certain periods is commonly definable. The arrangement of all the parts of a manuscript is also, when taken in connexion with other phenomena, a clue of great value. Indeed, palaeography and textual criticism together, enable men not only to fix often the country, and more often the date of a manuscript, but even the class and age of that from

which it was copied. A manuscript at Sinai would not in a few years suffer much from wear and tear, not even from sheer neglect, and the veriest tyro in such matters would never be deluded into belief that a venerable uncial from that monastery was written in our time by even so skilful a hand as that of Simonides. Our readers will not be tempted to cast aside the results of modern science on the *ipse dixit* of any man. In the case under consideration it would be the height of folly.

(k) Styles of writing

The different styles of writing in certain periods referred to above are in fact visible within Codex Sinaiticus itself because of the different correctors who worked over the manuscript. The nature and scope of these corrections are yet another stumbling block for Simonides. At least three of the journals we are concerned with draw attention to this.

The Clerical Journal, 11th September 1862, says:

The next remark we have to make is, that the Sinaitic MS. has been corrected in about eight thousand places. Now to read, to verify, and to insert these corrections must have been an enormous labour. How does Simonides account for them? He briefly observes that his uncle Benedict corrected the MS. in many places, and that, if necessary, he can point out both his corrections and those of Dionysius the calligraphist.

Then in April 1863 *The Journal of Sacred Literature* comments:

While we are alluding to the writing of the Codex we may observe, that not only is the text itself apparently written by different persons (Dr. Tischendorf says four) but it has been corrected and written upon by several others. The correctors belong to ages widely apart, some of them being comparatively recent. The marginal annotations, or inscriptions, also belong to different periods, and among them we find not only Greek uncials and cursives, but Arabic sentences of considerable antiquity. That all these corrections and additions, bearing the marks of so many different ages, have been introduced within the last twenty years or so, — rather, were all introduced between 1841 and 1844, — no man who knows anything of palaeography will believe. If they are forgeries they wear a very honest face, and surpass in extent and variety all other recorded forgeries. In the portions of the work recovered by Tischendorf, there are notes of fifteen thousand or more of these things.

In the same month *The Christian Remembrancer* asks various questions of both Simonides and Tischendorf regarding the corrections in ℵ:

Whether there is the difference which Professor Tischendorf states, between the handwritings of the original scribes, is a point which must be determined by inspection of the actual MS. He himself states that the handwritings have points of resemblance. If skilful palaeographists, after a careful examination of the MS., decide that, in their judgment four different, though contemporaneous hands, were set on to write the original

document, this is a further point for Dr. Simonides to explain. How comes his handwriting to present the appearance of four different handwritings. It may be observed that the hypothesis of Tischendorf is favoured by a somewhat similar instance in the Ephraem Rescript,in which he considers the Old and New Testament fragments to be written by different hands. But if it be decided that Professor Tischendorf is mistaken, this must of course diminish our confidence in his judgment and (as far as it goes) makes for the side of Dr. Simonides.

A further point to be decided, after inspection of the MS., is, Are the correctors so numerous as Professor Tischendorf supposes?or has he been over-fine in his discrimination? We know that he had distinguished two different correctors in the Ephraem Rescript, and eleven different correctors in the Codex Claromontanus. These distinctions have hitherto, as we believe, passed without challenge. The same may be the case with the Codex Sinaiticus. It will be for Dr. Simonides to explain, if he made all these corrections, why they present such different appearances, as to induce a practised judge, like Professor Tischendorf, to conclude that they belong to different hands who wrote centuries apart. A professional *artiste,* wishing *to forge* a quasi-ancient MS., might be able to execute so many different handwritings; but then he does it (if he can do it) with intention to deceive. It is for Dr. Simonides to explain why, if he found it necessary to correct his own transcript of his uncle's edition, he should have made his corrections in so many different forms, and of so many different hues. If, on the other hand, competent judges decide that Professor Tischendorf is mistaken about this host of correctors, this will much shake our confidence in his conclusions with regard not only to the Codex Sinaiticus, but to other similar editions, about which he has laboured, certainly, with no small assiduity, as, for instance, the Codex Claromontanus.

This final comment was of course only possible in the period before the facsimiles and the published editions of ℵ became available. After these publications had been examined, Tischendorf's judgment on the age of Sinaiticus was by and large accepted.

The only answer Simonides made on this matter is found in *The Guardian* supplement, 28th January 1863 (and in *The Literary Churchman,* 2nd February 1863):

> Benedict died at the time Mr. Stewart says, and I set out to Syme after three months for the sake of dispelling my grief on the death of my uncle, bringing with me, in a ship belonging to my family, the manuscript library to my father's house. Thence I went to Constantinople, and again returned to Mount Athos, after a few days; but the words never left out of my hands until the skins failed. Afterwards I added my corrections which my uncle had made, and returned the second time to Constantinople from Athos.
>
> For this reason the writing and ink vary a little; many of the notes being written with different ink and pens, and with less care.

(l) Itacisms

The Christian Remembrancer, April 1863, asks about the many itacisms in ℵ:

> How comes it that the Codex Sinaiticus is *full of itacisms*, insomuch that a collation, which takes note of all these, is a most laborious affair? Did Benedict blindly copy these from ancient MSS? Why should they be retained in a modern edition, to be offered as a present to the Emperor? Why are some corrected, others not so?

Scrivener's *Full Collation* p. lxix picks this up reminding us that in Simonides' letter of 3rd September 1862 he says that the learned Benedict kept the old spelling. Scrivener doubts if Benedict would have changed the true spelling of the Moscow bible into the false fashions prevailing in the oldest manuscripts. *The Literary Churchman* 16th December 1863 reviewing Scrivener's *Full Collation is* unconvinced of this:

> As to the «Itacisms» which constitute the third argument against Simonides, they really seem to us a strong one in his favour. The pronunciation of the modern Greeks constantly would lead them to this, especially if they write from dictation.

(m) Ammonian Sections

A further point picked out from Simonides' original letter by Scrivener in his *Full Collation* p. lxix is that Benedict had before him Codex Alexandrinus. Scrivener then asks why Simonides adopted the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons of that manuscript in copying ℵ while rejecting the larger κεφαλαῖα and the titles and headings which A also contains. In its review *The Literary Churchman* rejects this argument:

> Mr. Scrivener asks how it could arise that the MS. said to be made by Simonides, under Benedict's direction, should adopt the Ammonian Sections and the Eusebian Canons, and yet omit the larger κεφαλαῖα (the writer having before him the Codex Alex. at the time). We think that the reason of the case might furnish an answer. In making a MS. of their own, the writer and his uncle were not bound to follow those ancient peculiarities unless they found them necessary. Calligraphic reasons also may determined them. The argument is absolutely *nil.*

(n) Deception

The point that many critics of Simonides made was that at no time did Simonides intend to deceive anyone with the age of the manuscript.

Scrivener, *Full Collation* p. lxxf writes:

> That a boy of fifteen, or a youth of nineteen, who many years afterwards has exhibited surprising ignorance of much which even sciolists are presumed to know, should have executed within the compass of a few months a volume of 1400 pages comprising nearly four millions of uncial letter; and that too in such a fashion that WITHIOUT THE SMALLEST INTEN-

TION TO DECEIVE or to pass off his performance as an ancient work, he has actually misled the best critics in Europe: - this proposition we must confess to be so unlikely and indeed incredible that we could not receive it on any evidence whatever.

A newcomer to our discussion is W.T. Newenham who contributes the following telling and amusing letter on this topic to *The Guardian* on 28th January, 1863:

Sir — In our English courts of law, the weight of evidence, on either side, depends upon the credibility of the person who gives it. And this again is very materially affected by the antecedents and known character of the witness. Hence the severe and painfully searching investigations as to their previous habits of life, pursuits, and occupations, which learned counsel believe it their duty to make, and rightly so too.

In the question as to the antiquity of the above named Codex, Constantine Simonides asserts that it is *not* an ancient MS. copy of the Holy Scriptures, but one of our own times; and that he is the writer of it; and that the purpose for which it was written was that it might be offered as a present to the Emperor of Russia. Now, we can well understand and acquiesce in the appropriateness of such a gift, made by a body of religious men, to one whom they regard as the head of the Church to which they belong. And, that Church being the Greek Church, we can appreciate their good taste in having the MS. written in the Greek language, and in Greek characters. Moreover that the oldest style of character should be used; and that the writing should be on vellum or parchment, according to the ancient practice of the Church. All such particulars legitimately attach themselves to a perfect *renaissance,* which it would seem it was intended this MS. should be. But when we are told that the colour of the ink (a faded one doubtless) on the most ancient MSS. was carefully matched; that *bone* pens were made, and the hue of the skins imitated; and of course every little peculiarity of letter affected, so that the minutest evidence of antiquity might not be wanting; — I say, on all these accounts, and many others of a like kind, there does appear to be *prima facie* evidence of an intention to deceive, to cozen, to trick into a belief in the existence of something which had none.

In a word, is it not manifest that Constantine Simonides, his pious uncle Benedict, perhaps the celebrated hieromonachos Callinikos, and the rest of the holy brotherhood of Mount Athos, conspired together to delude the Emperor of Russia into the belief that they had presented him with a MS. copy of the Holy Scriptures as old as the third or fourth century, when, in fact, their gift was the work of an expert one of their own number? What consideration, in the shape of privileges, whether at the Holy Sepulchre, otherwise or elsewhere, may have been expected, deponent sayeth not. If not, then the MS. must have been intended for the Emperor's *use.* But his convenience, edification, and comfort in this respect would hardly have

been studied by employing *faded inks, obliterations of age, obsolete characters, and no longer used style of writing.* All which particulars were so exquisite in their semblance as to deceive the profound palaeographist Tischendorf himself.

Now, let us suppose that the police detected a man with a banknote executed so exactly as to deceive even a clerk of the Bank of England himself. Or suppose they were to discover such a note, and a man should come forward and avow himself—boastingly avow himself as the person who executed the highly finished work of art. The inference which they would draw would be of such a character as to impress them with the necessity of lodging the accomplished individual in the nearest police - station; which the magistrates would be quite ready enough to endorse by committing him, on the charge of forgery, to take his trial at the next sitting of the Central Criminal Court or the next assizes. Such, then, appears to be the analogous position in which Constantine Simonides has placed himself. He avows himself as the person who executed a document which, upon his own elaborate showing, and that of others competent to decide, was evidently meant to deceive.

He must therefore select one or the other of these two horns of a most uncomfortable dilemma on which to impale himself: either that he is in the habit of uttering forged documents, well knowing them to be such; or else his claim to the penmanship or fabrication of the Codex Sinaiticus must be dismissed as an untruth. On either hand Constantine Simonides cannot be regarded as a very reliable witness.

William Thos. Newenham

The Clerical Journal, 2nd October 1862, (repeated in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* January 1863) is also incredulous:

The «Codex» tells its own story in the eyes of men like Tischendorf, Tregelles, and others, who have made ancient manuscripts their study for long years. From the colour of the ink, from the form of the letters, from the arrangement of books and paragraphs, from the material written upon, and from various other facts, joined with great experience and attentive observations, these critics have unanimously inferred the extraordinary antiquity of the «Codex Sinaiticus». But in the face of them all, and with antecedents anything but favourable, Dr. Simonides comes forward and tells us they are wrong, that the manuscript was written by himself when an inexperienced youth, and that he has untold and unimaginable evidence in support of his statement. We confront his adduced evidence with that supplied by the «Codex» and the circumstances of its discovery, and we cannot conceive how a reasonable man can be in doubt as to the conclusion he must come to. It is not to be forgotten that Dr. Simonides, on his own shewing, has not seen the manuscript since it was removed from Sinai; and even if he wrote such a one as he says, this may not be the one which he wrote

> and says he saw afterwards at St. Catherine's Monastery on Sinai. However, we will not believe that he ever wrote such a manuscript as he describes - at least, not under the circumstances he has stated and our simple reason is that it could not by any possibility have happened. That Dr. Simonides is skilful in imitating ancient manuscripts, and that he has persuaded good scholars sometimes to accept them as of ancient date, is asserted very positively both in our own country and upon the Continent. It is certainly curious that he should now claim that skill, and should avow himself the unwitting agent in deceiving the first palaeographers in the world. His present claim will only serve to deepen the convictions to which we have alluded as so prevalent, abroad and at home.

The ancient appearance of the manuscript was not (as had been suggested by Bradshaw in a letter to *The Guardian* on 28th January, 1863) due to Simonides' intention to deceive, as Simonides is quick to point out in a reply in the following week's paper:

> Mr. Bradshaw's very proper and natural query - «How is it possible that a MS. written beautifully, and with no intention to deceive, in 1840, should in 1862 present so ancient an appearance?» - I answer simply thus: - The MS. had been systematically tampered with, in order to give it an ancient appearance, as early as 1852, when, as I have already stated, it had an older appearance than it ought to have had; and from what I then was, I am not surprised that Mr. Bradshaw should have been deceived in his estimate of its age.
>
> Again, I seriously assert (as Mr. Bradshaw seems to think I am jesting on this grave subject) that I wrote the Codex, to portions of which Tischendorf has given the names of Friderico - Augustanus and Sinaiticus; *and I challenge him to produce these Codices in London.* I will meet him there at any time he may appoint, and in a public meeting of literary men assembled for the purpose it shall be once and for ever decided whether he or Simonides has spoken truly.

But that is all Simonides himself is prepared to say. To the end he maintained his story that he had no intention to pass his manuscript of 1839-40 off as an ancient one.

The general conclusion reached by those who considered Simonides' claims to have some truth in them was either

i) that he could not have written the whole manuscript

ii) that he did not write any of the manuscript discovered by Tischendorf in 1844 and 1859. Scrivener, *Full Collation* p. lxviii says «If on the whole it shall be thought that we are under no logical necessity to deny that he wrote in 1839-40 some such manuscript as he described one thing appears quite certain, that the manuscript he may have then written neither is nor can be the Codex Sinaiticus».

Those who originally subscribed to (i) soon became convinced that (ii) was more likely, especially after the fac-simile edition of ℵ was available.

Many of course did not believe anything Simonides said!

Those who were willing to give Simonides the benefit of the doubt asked him to identify the distinctive marks he made on the manuscript (see Simonides' original letter). *The Literary Churchman* on 16th December, 1862 asks:

> Will Simonides challenge Tischendorf to *let him point out, in the presence of any scholars,* his own private marks which Simonides says that he himself made on the Codex now supposed to be ancient? cf. Tregelles (*Guardian* 11th February, 1863):
>
> And let Simonides show *where* Professor Tischendorf manifests that he was «greatly bewildered» by certain initials, and let him state *what* were the «several highly ingenious methods of accounting for them», which Tischendorf «invented». Let *this* be explained or admitted to be a fiction. If explanation is avoided, but one conclusion can be drawn. If Simonides inserted marks in the MS., it may prove that he *saw* it at Mount Sinai and wrote *on* it: if none of his marks are there, it shows that what he said about having «marked in the margin the initials of the different MSS.», is utterly and entirely false.

Inevitably Wright also challenged Simonides (*The Guardian* on 28th January, 1863):

> Simonides now points to an acrostic in Gen. xxiv. as proof that he wrote the Codex Sinaiticus. He knows perfectly well that no part of Genesis has been recovered, and therefore makes his assertion with full assurance that it cannot be put to the test.

And on 4th February, 1863:

> As a proof that the MS. is his own writing, he now exhibits tracings of four pages, in one at least of which is an acrostic containing his name. This one is from Genesis, which he knows perfectly well has not been recovered. These tracings he says he took when at Mount Sinai in 1852; for what reason is best known to himself. Let him exhibit them at the next meeting of the Royal Society of Literature, and there let them be discussed. They alone will show whether his story is true.

An alternative way of asking Simonides to verify his story was to ask him to demonstrate how he wrote ℵ by reproducing again a sample page. Such a challenge was made at The Royal Society of Literature meeting on 11th February, 1863. This is how the April issue of *The Journal of Sacred Literature* reported the event:

> A writer, rather friendly to him, wrote as follows in the *Literary Churchman,* after the meeting of the Royal Society of Literature above referred to:
>
> «Another speaker then rose, who had spent much time in examining the «Sinaitic» fac-simile, and described in detail the difficulty of the achievement pretended to by M. Simonides. The speaker said that he had discovered in the course of his examination of the document a *special pecularity* in its writing, which regularly repeated itself; and he could not, at

that moment, more clearly specify it; but *he challenged Mr. Simonides to sit down, and write six columns from a Greek Testament, in the manner and size of this Codex, and in the time stated, with the view of doing over again what he said he had already done;* as it would be easy to detect him, if he departed from this secret peculiarity which an inspection of the «Sinaitic» MSS. had elicited. This was somewhat startling, and many persons were eager to see what would follow. But Mr. Simonides simply arose and accepted the challenge, and we heard no more of the challenger».

We are sorry to say that there are mistakes here. The speaker in question did not «challenge» Mr. Simonides to write *six columns* from a Greek Testament, &c., but *suggested* in view of the peculiarity in question, that Mr. Simonides should write a sufficient number of *lines* to show that he was acquainted with the rule. Mr. Simonides was understood, not as accepting this present test or *experimentum crucis,* but as repeating what he before avowed in the *Guardian,* his readiness, under certain conditions, to write a Codex like the «Sinaitic» in the same space of time. This being the case, of course no more was heard of the imaginary challenger, who, moreover, could have had no further opportunity of being heard in a meeting burning with excitement, and where so many were so eager to speak. The report in the preceding extract is so far inexact.

Only later does Simonides offer to rewrite ℵ if £10,000 is deposited in a bank for him (see his letter to *The Guardian* of 21st January, 1863: p. 58). Wright (*Guardian* 28th January 1863) makes the following comment:

That Simonides has been called Euclid's Compasses, Chalkenteros, and other hard names, proves nothing. He has omitted to mention many which have been given him in Europe. With regard to his challenge, by which he offers, for the moderate sum of £ 10,000 sterling, to reproduce the Codex Sinaiticus, I reply as follows: My object is not to prove that Simonides can write something which shall look like an old MS., but to show that he did not write the one in question. To all my arguments he has given a most lame and unsatisfactory reply. He accuses me of lack of judgment and discernment, of straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel. It seems to me that all the camel swallowing is done by his own admirers.

The above were the main criticisms of Simonides' story. Another line of attack (and defence) was open at the same time, namely the attempt to find an independent witness to support Simonides. A Greek monk by name Kallinikos appeared on the scene in such a guise. His contribution to this bizarre episode is dealt with in the next chapter.

III. KALLINIKOS

The previous chapter listed many of the difficulties and problems raised by Simonides' story. One issue we have not yet drawn attention to is the presence of witnesses to Simonides' story.

The identity of characters named in the actual manuscript causes *The Christian Remembrancer*, April 1863, to ask:

> Can Dr. Simonides favour us with any information about Theophylact, Dionysius, and Hilarion, whose names occur in the Codex Sinaiticus? or have the names been inscribed since the parchments passed out of his keeping? or are the triad men of straw? or *noms de guerre?* Who are Antonius and Pamphilus, mentioned in the note in the Codex Friderico-Augustanus? Augustanus?

Dionysius' name is picked on by *The Journal of Sacred Literature*, October 1862:

> ....one thing we know, that in the extracts given by Tischendorf, in the *Notitia*, there is at page 24 a Greek note to this effect: «Remember, Lord, the soul of the sinner Dionysius, a monk, when Thou comest in Thy kingdom».Of course, we shall be told (i.e. by Simonides) that this is (his friend) the calligrapher, but we shall hesitate to admit the explanation.

and in the issue for July 1863:

> Upon one page of the *fac – similes* we find a copy of an inscription by one *Dionysius*, – no doubt the Dionysius to whom we owe the one of the same name, whom Mr. Simonides calls the «professional calligrapher» of Panteleemon, at Mount Athos. This Dionysius wrote a wretched, crabbed, cursive hand, and was undoubtedly among the living many centuries back. There is another autograph of one Hilarion, and to this we trace the «Deacon *Hilarion*» of Simonides. But Hilarion also has unquestionably been among the blessed for several hundred years. There are also other autographs which we pass over at present.

Of the witnesses cited by Simonides in his letter of 3rd. September 1862 none was ever produced. Neither Dionysius the scribe nor Germanus the monk nor Hilarion the deacon nor John Podromos the coffee - house keeper were called upon to corroborate the story. As far as the dignitaries are concerned no doubt the patriarch Anthimus and the ex - patriarch Constantius, whose blessing to the poor scholar was worth 25000 piastres, were dead by 1862.

Even uncle Benedict's role was challenged, but not until late in the controversy. A letter from W.A. Wright in *The Guardian* appeared on 11th November 1863 enclosing information he had sought from the British consul in Thessalonica.

M. SIMONIDES AND HIS UNCLE

> Sir – On the 5th of June last I wrote to Mr. Wilkinson, her Britannic Majesty's Consul at Salonica, requesting him to obtain for me from the

monks of Mount Athos answers to seven questions respecting Simonides. His reply reached me this morning. I enclose a copy of my questions, which you will see bear upon the story of Simonides as told by himself in the *Guardian* of September 3, 1862.

W. Aldis Wright

Salonica, Oct. 23, 1863

Dear Sir - I have delayed replying to your letter of the 5th of June last as I was in hopes of visiting Mount Athos in September. My occupations here having prevented me from carrying out my intention, I have been obliged to request the Archimandrite Dionysius of the Monastery of Xeropotami, a person well acquainted with the history of the Holy Mountain, to furnish me with the information you require respecting Simonides. I have now thw pleasure to enclose the Archimandrite's replies to your queries, from which you will perceive that your suspicions were but too well founded. The Archimandrite Dionysius is now, and has been for many years, the spiritual head of the monks of the Monastery of Xeropotami. He is a well-informed man, and his statement may be relied upon as correct. The Monastery of Xeropotami is situated close by the «Rossico» or St. Panteleemon. I send you the Archimandrite's own letter, but being written in rather barbarous Greek, I have added to it an English translation. Believe me, dear Sir, yours faithfully.

Richard Wilkinson

Questions sent by me to Mr. Wilkinson, the English Consul at Salonica, to be answered by the Monks of the Rossico Monastery. – W.A.W.

1. Was one named Benedict the spiritual head of the monastery between the years 1837 and 1840?

2. Did he die in the year 1840, in the month of August?

3. Was Simonides his nephew, and was he resident in the monastery between November, 1839, and August, 1840?

4. Did Benedict discover a hidden library in the year 1837?

5. Did Benedict and the brethren of the monastery contemplate making a present to the Emperor Nicholas in the year 1839 of a transcript of the Scriptures in ancient characters on vellum?

6. Was Dionysius at that time the professional calligrapher to the monastery, and did he decline the task which Simonides undertook?

7. Was Simonides ever at Mount Athos at all, and in what capacity vas he known there?

Copy of Answers, as translated by Mr. Wilkinson. - W.A.W.

1. Benedict belonged to the Russian Monastery, but he was never the spiritual head of the monks.

2. The said Benedict died in 1840, in the month of April, and not in August.

3. Simonides was neither his nephew, nor was he otherwise related to him.

4. The alleged discovery by Benedict of a library is entirely false.

5. The Rossico Monastery never possessed the Scriptures on parchment; it is impossible, therefore, that the monks should have ever contemplated presenting the Emperor with any such.

6. In the Rossico there were many monks of the name of Dionysius, but none of them was ever a calligrapher.

7. Simonides came twice to Mount Athos, in 1840 and in 1851. The last time (1851) the monks were so annoyed with his «tripotages» that they sent him away after a stay of only four months, during which he did nothing but visit some of the monasteries.

The indefatigible J.E. Hodgkin replied to this letter in *The Guardian* on 2nd December, 1863 (summarised in *The Literary Churchman* on lst December, 1863):

SIMONIDES AND BENEDICT

Sir – You assume that the letter from Mr. Wilkinson, published in the *Guardian* of November 11, will annihilate Simonides.... I submit that, on the contrary, it only affords evidence that any statement, no matter how loose, is readily adopted, if it impugns the veracity of so troublesome a correspondent as the former; and when I have shown, as I shall presently do, that the most important assertions of the Archimandrite Dionysius are false, I imagine that his letter will damage instead of aiding the cause of the opponents of Simonides. I shall first reply to those assertions of Dionysius which can be most readily disproved, and then give the rejoinder of Simonides to the rest.

In reply to Mr. W.A. Wright's second question, Dionysius says that Benedict died indeed in 1840, but in *April,* not in August. In a letter written to the Editor of the *Telegraph of the Bosphorus,* and published in that journal in December, 1851, a bitter opponent of Simonides, Melchisedec, on the Monastery of Laura, states that the death of Benedict took place in *May.*

In reply to the third question, Dionysius states that Simonides was *neither the nephew of Benedict, nor was he in any way related to him.*

I have before me the *Telegraph of the Bosphorus* of the 8th of December, 1851, in which is the commencement of the article above alluded to, written by one who has spared no pains in casting discredit upon the pretensions of Simonides to the discovery of the secret library in the Rossico monastery. Yet in this article *Benedict is spoken of in the highest terms, and always as the uncle of Simonides.* Had there been the *smallest* doubt about the relationship existing between them, the fact would have been eagerly seized on in this hostile letter of Melchisedec.

I can in the same manner entirely disprove the implied assertion of Dionysius, that Simonides was only at Mount Athos during a part of the

year 1840, and that, too, curiously enough, by the testimony of another opponent, hailing from the same monastery as your informant Dionysius.

In the same number of the *Telegraph of the Bosphorus* is a diatribe against Simonides, by a correspondent signing himself «*E. Xeropotamenos*», in which occurs this passage - λέγω δὲ μόνον, ὅτι ὁ Σιμωνίδης διέμεινεν εἰς Ἅγιον Ὄρος δύω ἔτη ἀπὸ τοῦ 1838 ἕως τοῦ 1841.Ποῦ δ' ἐδιδάχθη τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τῆς παλαιογραφίας δὲν ἠδυνήθην νὰ μάθω.

«*I have only to add that Simonides remained in the Holy Mountain two years, from 1838 to 1841; but where he got a knowledge of palaeography I could not discover*».

This writer has given Simonides a still longer stay than he himself claims, and thus entirely refutes the implied negative given by Dionysius to Mr. W.A. Wright's query. I may remark by the way, that the word σπερμολογιῶν is erroneously translated «*tripotages*». If it be necessary to veil the real meaning by a foreign word, it should be rendered «*babillages*», but surely the English word *chattering* is intelligible.

I conceive that the replies I have thus given, on the authority of adversaries of Simonides, will be taken as pretty conclusively settling Mr. W.A. Wright's questions Nos. 3 and 5, and as showing that even in the question of the month in which Benedict died the objectors are at variance.

Whilst the opponents of Simonides are continually accusing him of inconsistency and inaccuracy, they seem to forget how many contradictions have already crept into the charges against him. I subjoin three statements, all made by hostile writers, which will confirm what I have just stated:

Nicolaides says (*Parthenon*, Feb. 28, 1863) - «I am well acquainted with all the monasteries of Mount Athos.... I never heard of the monk Benedictus, *and do not believe he ever existed*».

Dionysius says (*Guardian*, Nov. 1, 1863) - «Benedict belonged to the Russian monastery, but he was never the spiritual head of the monks».

Melchisedec of Laura says (*Telegraph of Bosphorus* Dec. 8, 1861) - «That Benedict was distinguished both as a scholar and as a wise man, all those who knew his character admit».

The fact that one informant, who says he is well acquainted with all the monasteries in Mount Athos, is entirely ignorant of the existence of so important a character as Benedict, should make us pause before accepting as readily as you seem inclined to do the last set of imputations on the veracity of Simonides.

I will now condense the explanations given by Simonides himself of the motives which led Dionysius to make the statements which have appeared.

Between the two classes of monastery in Mount Athos, the *Coenobiac* and the *Idiorhythmic,* there is the greatest rivalry, and in many cases even enmity. The monks of the former class consider that those of the latter have obtained funds which were originally intended for their own order, and that these funds, derived from possessions in Moldavia, Wallachia, &c., are moreover grossly misapplied in detail. Whatever may be the merits of this controversy, which has long existed, one thing is certain, that Simonides, in his zeal for the Rossico and other *Coenobiac* monasteries, has for many years spoken openly and bitterly against some of the principal men of the *Idiorhythmic,* of whom he has, of course, made deadly enemies.

Such were his antagonists already cited, *Melchisedec* of Laura and *E(ugenius)* of Zeropotami; such is this present accuser *Dionysious* of Zeropotami. A reference to pp. 116, 117, 139 of the book concerning Nicolas, Bishop of Methone, published by Simonides in London in 1858, will show that he attacks the above trio by name.

It is strange that Mr. Wilkinson, instead of writing to the head of the *Rossico* monastery, was «*obliged to apply*» to the head of a monastery of the *other* order, and to a man well known to be opposed to Simonides. This may be the way to get rid of this troublesome gentleman, but it is not the way to get at the whole truth.

Simonides further says that Benedict *was* the spiritual head of the monastery, though during the last few years of his life he retired from the *secular* duties connected with his position. He refers you to the Patriarch of Constantinople for confirmation of the truth of this statement.

I hope to be able to discover from some of the Greek newspapers, what was the position of Benedict at the close of his life; the part which he took in the re-establishment of the Rossico monastery was one of the points in dispute between Simonides and Melchisedec.

Simonides repeats that he died in August. The question may not be an important one, but, as his opponents disagree, we may allow that the *nephew* is probably in the right.

In reply to question No. 4, he says that as the discovery was kept utterly secret at the time, it is impossible for any person to declare that it was or was not made, except those actually engaged in it.

It is clear that Dionysius did not understand the bearing of No. 5, as his reply is wide of the mark.

Dionysius is, or was, a celebrated calligrapher in the Rossico monastery: he was originally a private monk of the σκήτη of St. Anna; he copied the treatise of Pauselenus about Dionysius of Agrapha at the request of Pappa Macarius for *M. Didron.* It is possible that he is mentioned in that work.

I have extremely condensed the statements of Simonides, but will obtain full answers to other points connected with the queries, if it be desired...

The Clerical Journal of 11th October, 1862 (i.e. before Benedict's part was challenged) stated «The names he gives us are not worth anything until impartial and independent persons can show that they are realities and represent true witnesses». Simonides attempted to produce such a witness by December 1862.

KALLINIKOS HIEROMONK

This witness who had not appeared earlier was a Greek monk of Alexandria named Kallinikos. In *The Guardian* of 3rd December, 1862, and *The Literary Churchman* of 16th December 1862 two communications appeared differing but little from each other and both translated from original Greek letters signed Kallinikos the Hieromonk. They are dated Alexandria 16th October 1862[16] and we are told they bore the correct postmark. The Greek is printed and then a translation follows. We will take the version of *The Literary Churchman* as it is somewhat longer, the additions to the letter in *The Guardian* being marked by italics.

> You are aware of all that the excellent and much enduring Simonides has published as to the Pseudo Sinaitic Codex, abstracted from the library of the Greek monastery at Sinai, by Dr. Tischendorf. The facts are really so. And I counsel you not to continue circulating contrary statements, for you will greatly sin in foisting on the world a new MS. as an old one, and especially a MS. containing the Holy Scriptures. *Injury to the Church must accrue from all this, even from the evidently numerous corrections of the MS.* And that this is a new MS. I openly proclaim, both before the all - seeing God, and before men; and further, I protest to you, Messrs. Editors, that this is a genuine work of the indefatigable Simonides. For I myself saw him with my own eyes, in February, 1840, writing it in Athos; *and, owing to the death of the head of the monastery, he left the work unfinished, and went to Constantinople, taking the Codex with him,* which also he delivered to the illustrious patriarch Constantius, and he sent it to the monastery in Sinai *by a monk of that house, named Germanus, whose subordinate still lives in Athos to attest the writer.* And the partiarch sent the Codex there, in order that the transcript might be compared with other copies of the Old and New Testament, and then be transcribed by the same Simonides, and sacredly presented to the Emperor of Russia, on the part, not of the monastery of St. Pantaleemon, *according to the original intention of Benedict,* but on the part of the partiarch Constantius. On this account, the hieromonk Callistratus, a wise man, *and companion of the same house,* undertook the comparison of it, and did compare it with other codices of the same house, by command of Constantius, the patriarch. And he, having partly corrected it, left it in the library awaiting the return of Simonides, *the first calligrapher in Greece.* He not coming in good time, the work was altogether neglected, and remained in the common library of the monastery for some time: until Dr. Tischendorf (coming to the monastery in Sinai, in

16. 16th according to The Literary Churchman: 15th according to The Guardian.

May, 1844, and spending some days there, and having examined the MS. carefully *and suspecting it to be ancient),* tore off a small part of it, privately, and went his way, as if nothing had happened, leaving the rest of it in the position which it had before. *He perpetrated this great wrong without scruple.* Finally, coming again to the same monastery, he took also the remaining portion of the MS. with the aid of the Russian Consul, on the promise that he would return it. *And they both promised to the Bishop of Sinai many and great gifts, which, in my opinion, they will never perform: because, at other times, many such promises were made by a certain Russian archimandrite, named Porphyrius, who took away many MSS. from the monastery of St. Dionysius, in Athos, and from others, and they were never fulfilled.*

All these things, then, I know, being on the spot, and I declare them openly for the dear truth's sake. And I further assert, that the Codex which, *per fas et nefas* Dr. Tischendorf abstracted, is the very same which Simonides wrote twenty - two years ago. For I saw it in the hands of Tischendorf, and recognised the work, and I first mentioned it to Simonides, who had no knowledge of the fact before. Evidently he knew not the abstraction of his work from the monastery in Mount Sinai. I read also at first this acrostic in it, «Simonides'entire work»: but, after two days, the leaf containing this formal acrostic had been removed – it being unknown, as yet, by whom this was done. I know too, still further, that the same Codex was cleaned, with a solution of herbs, on the theory that the skins might be cleaned, *but, in fact, that the writing might be changed, as it was, to a sort of yellow colour.*

These things then, Messrs. Editors, I have thought it my duty, unasked, to make known to you before I die – for I am an old man, and very near to death; and you, being as you are, heralds of the truth – as such you will greatly serve the truth, and those who follow truth, if you will exactly publish the contents of this my letter; or, otherwise, you will give account to God in the Day of Judgment. Farewell in the Lord, &c.

Your very devoted servant, and earnest worshipper of God,
CALLINICUS HIEROMONK

Alexandria, October 16—28, 1862[17]

In the words of *The Christian Remembrancer* (July, 1863, p. 203) «No testimony could be more reasonable or more explicit».

17. F. Field corrected the translation in a letter to The Literary Churchman. January 1st, 1863.

Not only does Kallinikos' letter verify points made by Simonides and which had since been doubted but it adds to the information given by Simonides in his original letter. *The Christian Remembrancer continues:*

> He can tell us all about this Codex abstracted from Sinai. He had seen the unwearied Simonides writing it at Athos, in February 1840. He knows for certain (and this, be it observed, is more than Simonides knew on Sept. 3) that the venerable patriarch Constanthus had sent it to Sinai, to be compared there with other MSS. of the Holy Scriptures, then to be transcribed again by the same Simonides, and presented to the Emperor Nicholas, no longer as a gift from the Monastery of Panteleemon, but from the patriarch himself. The holy monk Callistratus compared the Codex in part with Sinai copies, and left the rest against Simonides' return (when had he been there before?). Meanwhile, about May 1844, Tischendorf visited the monastery, and, being allowed to peruse and re - peruse it frequently,«abstracted secretly a small portion of it» and, coming again, at length obtained the rest, through the Russian Consul, by extravagant promises, never likely to be fulfilled. That Tischendorf obtained the identical codex written by Simonides, Callinicos is quite sure, for he saw it in the hands of Tischendorf, recognised the work, and first informed Simonides thereof (was this in 1844 or 1859? Probably the latter), for originally he had read on it the hemistich Σιμωνίδου τὸ ἔργον; but, two days afterwards, this line had disappeared. The MS. had also been cleaned with lemon - juice, professedly for the purpose of washing the vellum, but, in reality, to weaken the freshness of the letters.

From Simonides' original story we were expected to assume that Tischendorf must either have been incompetent at judging the age of a manuscript or else be putting forward fraudulent claims. We have already shown that the two English scholars Tregelles and Bradshaw confirmed Tischendorf's judgement about the age of Sinaiticus when they saw the manuscript in Leipzig. However since the letter of Kallinikos the charge becomes more serious against Tischendorf. From that letter we not only learn that Simonides had known of the existence of that portion of his manuscript that came to be designated Codex Friderico-Augustanus but that Tischendorf was a thief. As Wright points out in *The Guardian* on 21st January, 1863:

> An absent scholar is charged with a base and impudent literary fraud. It is even insinuated that he is a thief. I have thought it my duty, to do my best to rebut the calumny. I would call attention to the fact that, since the first letter of Kallinikos, the charge against Tischendorf has assumed a different complexion. It was at first a charge of ignorance. Tischendorf, himself deceived, was about to publish as a work of the fourth century one which had been written by a living man. Now, however, it is insinuated that Tischendorf knew the MS. to be the writing of Simonides, and removed the traces of his handiwork. He is accused, therefore, of the grossest and

most impudent fraud. Believing him to be innocent, I shall endeavour to expose his accuser. This, Sir,is my *animus.*

Wright's motive in trying to expose Simonides is therefore to defend Tischendorf. Tregelles likewise recognises the importance of exposing Simonides, although *his* motive is pious:

> True knowledge of palaeography is closely connected with the facts of the transmission of Holy Scripture. This is no mere literary question, but one bearing on what we know of the inspired oracles of God. To forge a MS. as if ancient is to endeavour to uphold readings in such a copy as if they had the vantage - ground of early authority; a procedure the folly of which is only surpassed by its sin: to pretend to have written a MS. really ancient, and thus to seek to make all palaegraphic facts matters of doubtful questioning, is a sin of a similar kind. This it is which makes it so needful to expose the pretensions of Simonides and his coadjutors. It is vain for the whole matter to be laughed at as a mere quarrel of critics. It may be easy to suggest suspicions on both sides; but merely to do this is simply to make all truth seem uncertain. It is not a question of the reputation of Tischendorf, Simonides, Tregelles, Hodgkin, Wright, or Stewart, but of *facts,* of an established and momentous kind, which some choose to assail, while others turn the whole subject into sport. It may be sport to a contemporary journal, but it is matter of life and death to those who see its bearing on God's Holy Word.

That extract comes from the letter Tregelles sent to *The Guardian,* 11th February, 1863. The reference to «the contemporary journal» is to *The Literary Churchman* the tone of whose reporting Tregelles objected to.

Thus Wright and Tregelles at least were unconvinced by Kallinikos' letter. In any case this letter tended to add to the problems connected with Simonides rather than obliterate them.

The very fact that it is Simonides himself who commended Kallinikos in a letter he sent to *The Guardian,* 10th December, 1862 (repeated in *The Literary Churchman,* 16th December, 1862) weakens any support which Kallinikos may have been able to give Simonides:

> Sir,
>
> I ascertain from letters received in the month of November last, that the hieromonachos Kallinikos of Alexandria, has written to you, refuting the antiquity of the Codex Sinaiticus, and declaring that it has been written in modern days, and by myself. I beg you, therefore, briefly to acknowledge the receipt of it, and, at the same time, to say whether you have any intention of publishing it.
>
> I must inform you that the above - mentioned Kallinikos is a perfectly upright and honourable man, well known for truth and probity, so that his simplest word may be relied on. He was living at Athos when I wrote the Codex Sinaiticus (which was about 1840); he overlooked me during the pro-

gress of the work, and thus became an eye - witness of it. His testimony may, therefore, be considered as invaluable.

I am, Sir, yours truly,
C. Simonides

The Guardian makes the following comment after printing this letter:

We publish this letter as helping to prove complicity between the writer of it and the witness to whom it bears testimony. Simonides hardly seems aware that arguing in a circle is a fallacy in the rules of evidence as well as in those of logic. Callinicus bears witness to Simonides, and *vice versa* Simonides bears withess to Callinicus. Can neither of them call some independent witness to bear real evidence to character?

The Literary Churchman significantly makes no such comment.

Let us now use the words of *The Christian Remembrancer*, July 1863, to pick up the story of Kallinikos and Simonides:

Mr. Wright, nothing daunted, soon rallies and renews the assault. He perceives clearly enough that, whatever might be the *design* of the holy monk's letter, its effect was to supply, as well as could be at this late period, the slight gap in Simonides' case relating to Cod. Friderico - Augustanus, which the conversation at Cambridge, on the 7th of October, had brought to his mind. Pursuing this hint, Mr. Wright calculates that a letter might have left London for Alexandria, *via* Marseilles, on October 10th, and reached on the 20th or 21st. A return letter from Alexandria, written on the 27th (Callinicos's date, Oct. 15, is, of course, old style) might be sent either on the 28th or on Nov. 4th, in full time to get to London when those of Callinicos did. Hence he rather intimates than states his opinion that from this and other circumstances he presses on us, Callinicos can hardly have a real existence; that letters written in England may easily be posted at Alexandria.

The letter of Wright, to which *The Christian Remembrancer* refers appeared in *The Guardian* 10th December 1862, and is of such importance in the unmasking of Simonides that we will reproduce it here at length:

Sir – To my letter of 27th October[18] M. Simonides will reply at the proper time. I should have thought no time so proper as the present. As he declines to explain the difficulties I then brought forward, I presume he has no answer to make. He reserves his defence, and I therefore proceed with my case. In one respect, however, he has given me material assistance—I perhaps ought to say his friend Kallinikos, but the two are one. It had been better for Mr. Simonides had his friend, «an old man awaiting death», passed away without making this sign. I will take his evidence for what it is worth.

The letter of Kallinikos has the unfortunate merit of proving too much. The writer asserts that he saw Simonides writing the Codex

18. Published in The Guardian 5th November. See p. 40f.

Sinaiticus in February 1840. I can fully believe that if Simonides wrote the Codex, the writer of the letter signed «Kallinikos hieromonachos», saw him engaged at the work. But Kallinikos not only saw Simonides writing the codex; he knows for certain that it was delivered to the Patriarch Constantius. Well and good. So far his account tallies with the letter which Simonides wrote, and which was published in the *Guardian* of the 3rd of September. If you refer to this, you will see that the Patriarch Constantius complied with the wish of Simonides that the MS. should be deposited in the library of Mount Sinai. Not a word of its being placed there for the purpose of being collated with other MSS. in the library. Not a word about its subsequent transcription for the Emperor of Russia. I will not discuss the question as to the capacity of the monks of Mount Sinai for the collation which was assigned them. All I will say is that here Simonides' friend has known more than Simonides himself did, at the time he wrote the letter to which I have alluded. How this has come about is to me perfectly patent.

But to proceed with the letter of Kallinikos. It appears that he not only saw Simonides writing the MS., he not only was perfectly informed of its delivery to the venerable Patriarch Constantius, but, most remarkable coincidence!—he was on the spot when Professor Tischendorf visited Mount Sinai in 1844, and, as he says, abstracted a small portion of the MS. This «small portion» was some forty—three leaves; but no matter. Kallinikos was again on the spot when Tischendorf carried off the remainder of the MS. He appears to have possessed the admirable quality of being exactly where he was wanted.

At this point I would pause; but I will quote one other sentence from the letter of Kallinikos. He says, «I first informed Simonides, who was previously in ignorance thereof, of the abstraction of his codex from the library of the Monastery of Mount Sinai». If you will refer to the letter of Simonides himself, you will see that he says, «About two years ago I saw the first facsimiles of Tischendorf, which were put into my hand at Liverpool, by Mr. Newton», when, he adds, «I at once recognised my own work, as I immediately told him». We have therefore the choice between two alternatives. Kallinikos either refers to the abstraction in 1844 or in 1859. If he refers to the former, he must have left his friend in ignorance for sixteen years; if to the latter, for more than a year. Both these suppositions are inconsistent with the close intimacy which subsists between Simonides and Kallinikos. These are plain facts from which your readers can form their own conclusions.

To proceed. The letter of Kallinikos charges Tischendorf with theft. If Kallinikos were not apocryphal, the charge would be libellous. But as in the former instance he knew too much, in this he knows too little. In Simonides' letter, published in the *Guardian* on the 3rd of September, the writer says of the MS. which he professes to have written himself, «I saw it there (i.e., at Mount Sinai) myself, and begged the librarian to inform me

how the monastery had acquired it; but he did not appear to know anything of the matter, and I, for my part, said nothing. However, I examined the MS., and found it much altered, having an older appearance that it ought to have. The dedication to the Emperor Nicholas, placed at the beginning of the book, had been removed». With these exceptions, there is not a hint that the MS. was not as perfect as when it left his hands; not a hint that «the original covers, made of wood and covered with leather», had been removed and that, in fact, the MS was entirely disintegrated and large portions of it lost.

In 1844, eight years before the time at which Simonides says he saw it again, Professor Tischendorf had carried off some loose leaves, which were lying in the monastery utterly uncared for. But before Tischendorf's visit, 272 leaves had been lost at the beginning of the MS. How does Simonides account for these? Surely the gap which would have been caused by this loss would not have escaped notice. He cannot pretend to say that they were torn out with the dedication to the Emperor of Russia. I have my own reasons for believing that Simonides first became acquainted with the fact that Tischendorf, so early as 1844, had brought from Mount Sinai some portion of the MS., on the 7th of October of the present year, in the Cambridge University library; and that he there saw for the first time the facsimile reprint of the Codex Friderico - Augustanus. Perhaps he will reply to this at «the proper time». If he does not, my opinion will be confirmed, though it can scarcely be strengthened. If he does, I have no doubt that, like his friend Kallinikos he will create at least as many difficulties as he solves. And even when he has replied to this and my last letter, I shall still have some points upon which I shall desire further information.

In conclusion, as Simonides states in his letter that he can point to two distinct pages in the MS. which contain the most unquestionable proof of its being his writing, I challenge him to place in your hands a statement of those marks of recognition in a sealed envelope, which shall be opened in the presence of impartial and competent witnesses, and compared with the facsimile reprint of the Codex Sinaiticus which Tischendorf had just completed. Unless this is done at once it will be valueless. If it is not done, but one conclusion can be drawn from it. If it is done, and the comparison proves satisfactory, it will only show that Simonides has seen the MS. at Mount Sinai, as he professes to have done.

I would now call attention to another point in the narrative of the fortunes of the MS. as related by Simonides. After the work of transcription had abruptly come to an end by the death of his uncle in August, 1840, Simonides took the MS. with him to Constantinople. It was there seen by the Patriarch Constantius, who urged him to present it to the library of Mount Sinai. The *present,* for which he received 25,000 piastres, was made, and the receipt of the volume acknowledged in a letter from Constantius, dated «13th August, 1814». Some time after, how long we do not find, it was sent to its destination. I would call attention especially to the fact that

in the original story nothing is said about the MS. being sent to Mount Sinai for collation with other MSS. in order that it might again be transcribed by Simonides. This is a fact which we first learn from the letter of Kallinikos. Furthermore, the monks seem to have set small store by the MS., for in May, 1844, it was found by Tischendorf in tatters, and some loose leaves, utterly uncared for, were brought away by him and published in 1846 as the Codex Friderico - Augustanus. Of this «abstraction» by Tischendorf we are first informed by Kallinikos. Simonides knew nothing of it when he wrote his first letter to you. I have reason to believe that he first became aware of the existence of the Codex Friderico—Augustanus on the 7th of October of the present year. The date of Kallinikos' letter is October 15, old style. I presume that is October 27 new style. A mail for Alexandria *via* Marseilles left London on October 10. Letters sent by this mail would reach Alexandria about the 20th or 21st. A return letter from Alexandria might be sent either on Oct. 28 or Nov. 4. There was, therefore, ample time for this newly acquired fact to be transmitted to Alexandria and to return. I will leave you, Sir, to draw your own conclusions from these points which I have put before you. Taking into consideration the remarkable coincidence between the letter of Kallinikos and the story it is intended to corroborate, the extreme improbability of his having been on the spot at such critical moments in the history of the MS., and the bringing to light for the first time a fact in that history with which Simonides had only recently become acquainted, I submit that there are grave reasons why we should regard its testimony with suspicion. Coincidences like these have fallen to the lot of Simonides more than to the lot of any living man. Does he want confirmation of a statement, he has the authority of MSS., and inscriptions to which he can appeal at will. I recommend any of your readers who desire an illustration of this, to refer to his discussion of the disputed reading in Matt. xix. 24 *(Facsimiles, & c.,* p. 45, & c.,). He brings forward inscriptions from monuments in Lycia, Cilicia, and at Gaza; and gives not only the readings from some eight or none MSS. which are preserved at Mount Sinai, at Mount Athos, or the Monastery of S. Saba in Palestine, but what is most remarkable, and to my mind most instructive, he gives the verse, and, in some instances, the context in *facsimile.* Surely no man was ever so fortunate as Simonides. He finds whatever he looks for, and now he has found his friend Kallinikos.

Wright then adds an amusing tail - note to the letter which is taken up seriously, as we shall see later:

> Permit me to congratulate you, Sir, on the wide circulation which the *Guardian* has attained. I should think few papers can boast of Greek readers at Alexandria.

We will also reproduce a similar letter written by Wright to *The Literary Churchman,* 1st January 1863, which underlines some of the points made earlier:

Next comes upon the scene that wonder of wonders, the hieromonachos Kallinikos, who has cosmopolitan sympathies of no ordinary kind, and is a constant reader of the *Guardian* and *Literary Churchman*. Here, Sir, is another of the many improbabilities which meet us at every step in the statement of the case as it comes from Simonides and his admirers. Simonides makes an assertion with regard to his share in the transcription of the «Codex Sinaiticus» which has this feature,in common with a true narrative, that it contains many circumstantial details. But in the face of the glaring improbabilities with which, at the same time, it abounds, these details are of no worth whatever; and no appeals to Greek coffeehouse keepers in Constantinople can give weight or credibility to an account which itself contains so many elements of a doubtful nature. At this crisis Kallinikos comes to the rescue. And who is Kallinikos? We infer from his own account that he takes in (This is not quite fairly stated by Mr. Wright. The hieromonk hardly implies that.- Ed. L.C.) the *Guardian* and *Literary Churchman,* and that he is a Greek monk. Furthermore, his veracity is attested by Simonides himself. More improbabilities again. A Greek monk at Alexandria, of whom no one can give any account, a constant reader of the *Guardian* and *Literary Churchman,* comes forward, and, to rescue his friend's character, delivers himself of a secret which he has carried in his breast for eighteen years and more—the secret of Tischendorf's delinquencies. Kallinikos is the very model of a witness. He gives evidence on all the points that Simonides himself had brought forward. He saw Simonides writing the MS., knew of its delivery to the patriarch Constantius, and knew, moreover, the name of the monk who carried it to Mount Sinai, as well as the name of the monk who collated it, with other MSS. there. He saw Tischendorf with it in his hands in May, 1844, and knew that he tore some of the leaves out, and stole them without scruple; and, finally, that he deluded the monks by false promises to part with the MS., without any intention of carrying these promises into effect. He insinuates, moreover, that leaf containing the signature of Simonides disappeared after the MS. had been in Tischendorf's hands.

I wish, Sir, you had deferred the publication of this letter of Kallinikos till you had ascertained more about him. What will be the result of your enquiries? I think I can hazard a shrewd guess. The strong improbability that a Greek monk at Alexandria should interest himself in a discussion which is going on in the English newspapers; that he should come forward in the very nick of time, and give precisely the evidence that Simonides wanted; that he should have been an eyewitness to all the most important scenes in the history of the MS., that he should know more of its fortunes than Simonides did on Sept. 3, and exactly so much, and no more, than he knew on the 7th of October, constitutes, to my mind, a series of difficulties which are scarcely explicable on the supposition that Kallinikos has a real ex-

istence, but which are easily solved by another and very palpable hypothesis.

I will leave you to decide whether, of these two statements, that made by Tischendorf, or that made by Simonides, carries with it the greatest amount of improbability. The issue of this dispute will leave one or other of these men with the imputation of being a common rogue. We must have in this case stronger evidence than the bare work of a Greek monk....

I remain, Sir, Yours faithfully,
W.A. Wright

Thus Wright argued that Simonides could have written «Kallinikos'» letter himself, sent it to Alexandria to have it posted back to England. In January 1863 therefore Simonides had to answer this new charge against him.

To do so, more letters from Kallinikos were reproduced. Two of these are dated later than the first letter published, but of the others one is dated 21st November 1861 and the other in 1858.

The letters are printed in *The Literary Churchman* 16th January 1863 and more fully in *The Guardian* 14th January 1863. In the former the editor introduces the letters in this way:

The «Sinaitic MS».

In laying before our readers further documents illustrative of the controversy pending respecting this Codex, we think it right to say that we have taken no little trouble to form an opinion of our own as to the character and pretensions of Simonides. We can assure Mr. Wright that he is mistaken in supposing Simonides to have but a recent acquaintance with the C. Friderico-Augustanus. The letters which we now submit will bear on other points of evidence; and as far as they go, we pledge ourselves to their authenticity–if we have any competency to form a judgment. We are not disposed to anticipate any conclusion; but we have seen and heard enough to impel us, more than ever, to demand fair play for M. Simonides.

We cannot but express our regret, that at a recent meeting, in which a valuable palimpsest and fragments of very ancient MSS. were produced by M. Simonides, there should have been anything like a loss of temper on the part of some who were to have assisted in such an investigation as is demanded.

As to Callinicus–he is evidently an old man who is full of his one idea, and repeats himself continually. What his reputation is at Alexandria, we shall soon know. In the mean while, it is unworthy of our character as Englishmen, and our fame as scholars, to allow such a matter as this to be stifled: nor can Dr. Tischendorf blame us if we are anxious that these doubts should be set at rest in his lifetime, instead of being reserved, to the great prejudice of his literary character, and lasting ruin of the MS. itself, for future generations.

In *The Guardian* it is Simonides himself who is allowed to introduce the letters. He does so by beginning sarcastically referring to *The Guardian's* footnote that Kallinikos commended Simonides and Simonides commended Kallinikos:

> Every one must admire the fair and impartial remarks appended to the letter which you did me the honour to publish on the 10th of December, 1862. It is not my fault that I have not sooner replied to your insinuations of *complicity* with Kallinikos.
>
> In the month of November I forwarded to my friend Mr. Scott, in Manchester, for translation, my reply to the letter of Mr. Wright of 5th November, and with it a copy of one of the letters of Kallinikos, which I sent you today for publication.
>
> I have only this day received a portion of the translation of my reply, and that of the letter has not come to hand at all, so that I am indebted to another hand for its appearance even as early as the present time.
>
> If you will refer to the original you will find that Kallinikos (who certainly knows not a word of English) never asserts that he «read in the *Guardian* my letter», but that «he has read that your journal was the means of making known to the world». The way in which this came about is very simple. I wrote to Kallinikos giving him a copy of my original Greek letter from which the English translation which appeared in your journal was made, and appended the strip containing the article in English. You will see by the subjoined letter what was his reply, and why I wrote to you to ask if his letter had been received, as also I did to the *Times and Literary Churchman,* but am still without reply from those papers. My early connection with Kallinikos will be, in degree, ascertained by reference to his own letters. It is not for me to bring witnesses to the respectability of a man well known in his own country, and whom I have not brought forward as a witness, but who has written to you on his own responsibility. It is not on secondary evidence, but on that of the Codex itself, that I rely; but as his name has been associated with mine, it is right that the public should know what I am able to show them of his acquaintance with the history of the Codex.
>
> It is quite evident that Mr. W.A.Wright does not know anything of the subjects about which he writes, as his arguments are as weak as they are malicious. I reserve my reply to him till next week, having already trespassed largely on your space. If I had a good knowledge of the English language, neither he nor any one else would have reason to complain of the tardiness of my replies, but the necessity for translation causes great delay, and engenders many errors.
>
> *C. Simonides*[19]

In the following week's issue Simonides gives a much more impassioned and apocalyptic commendation of the Hieromonk's letters:

19. This letter was sent from Liverpool where Simonides' main ally J.E. Hodgkin was living.

What, then, have you to oppose to the evidence of living men occupying the exalted rank of priesthood, O zealous defender of the pseudo - Sinaitic Codex? Other testimony I shall adduce after a little, and shall prove palpably the folly of yourself and patrons. Do you disbelieve the attestations of the Patriarchs, Archimandrites, and monks of the Eastern Church? If you are still incredulous, I say to you, remain faithful in your faithlessness. And I, for my part, by no means care from henceforth about this. I have proclaimed the truth, although well I know that such truth has both very great and disagreeable results. It behoves me, however, to speak, because my conscience itself, and education, which even Mr. Tischendorf admires as shown above, and the Church to which I belong – viz., the Greek, occupying the first rank among the Churches from which the grace of truth issued and spread abroad - do not permit me to conceal the truth in any manner; for I will answer as I should to the All–seeing God in the Day of Judgment. Therefore I said I have spoken, I have no sin– Wholly yours.

C. Simonides

The first of the four letters of Kallinikos to Simonides is dated 5th (= 17th) August 1858 and comes not from Alexandria but from Smyrna.

...These also send thee greeting, the Deacon Hilarion, and thy friends Nicander and Niphon, who lent thee the Books of Esdras at the time when thou wast preparing in Athos, at the exhoration of my uncle, the present (of the Holy Scriptures) to the glorious Emperor Nicholas. They also wished to know whether the work was finished, and given to the Emperor, and whether thou wert suitably required for it; because they had no certain knowledge about these matters. I told them all about it, and how the manuscript in question is now in Mount Sinai, and how thy indifference (forgive me, my son, for this true statement of mine) frustrated the original intention. I certified them that this MS. of the Scriptures is still preserved in Sinai (as thou also knowest), because I saw it there with my own eyes when I was in the Monastery of St. Catherine in 1845 in the month of July, and handled it with my own hands, and found it very defective, and somewhat changed and when I asked the reason, I understood from Gabriel, the keeper of the treasures, that his predecessor had given the manuscript to a German, who visited the monastery in 1844 in the month of May, and who having had the MS. in his hands several days, secretly removed a part of it, and went away during the time that the librarian lay ill, afflicted with a typhoid fever. Nothing more could I learn about it, but I hope (if God will) to go next year again into Egypt, and thence to Sinai, when I shall search into all things, and send the result for thy information and that of thy friends...

Farewell, my son, and pardon the garrulity of an old man. - Thy Spiritual Father,

Kallinikos Hieromonachos

The second letter is dated 1861 but, as we learn later, had been transmitted in an envelope and did not bear any postmark. Only the *Guardian* prints Simonides' introduction to this letter:

> Having seen the *Standard* of Monday, May 23, 1859, an account of the discovery at Mount Sinai, I wrote to Kallinikos on the subject, and received from him a letter on which unfortunately I cannot now lay my hand, but which I will publish if I should hereafter find it. This letter, however, not being sufficiently explicit, especially as regards the identification of the «newly found» Codex with my own, I wrote to him again for a more circumstantial statement, which he gave in the following letter.
>
> *C.S.*

The letter follows and it is interesting to read the invective poured out on Tischendorf, who at one point is said to be quite ignorant of Greek!

> + Dear Son in the Lord, Simonides, Grace be to thee and peace from the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, One God.
>
> That master and pupil of all guile, and all wickedness, the German Tischendorf, has unexpectedly rushed into thy net: for having inspected in the common library (where it was found a short time ago, and where it was placed by thy spiritual father Callistratus when he went to Alexandria) the Codex which thou wrotest at Athos, some twenty—two years ago, as a present to the deceased Emperor of Russia, Nicholas I, at the request of thy wise and distinguished uncle Benedict, and subsequently going to Constantinople after his death gavest unfinished to the blessed Patriarch Constantius, who sent it to Mount Sinai by the Monk Germanus of Sinai, whom thou knowest, and which was afterwards given to the Hieromonachus Callistratus to be compared with the three old Codices of the Sacred Scriptures (which thou knowest, and which are kept in the treasury), and was then disregarded because thou didst not make thy appearance at the proper time in Mount Sinai to transcribe it according to the earnest wish of the Patriarch, he has proclaimed it as genuine, and as the oldest of all the known Codices in Europe of the Old and New Testaments.
>
> Alas for the palaeographical knowledge of such as he! And if, O my son, the sages of Western Europe take knowledge of and criticise matters in the same fashion as Tischendorf, the shallow leader of Leipzig, I must say that no true criticism or sound judgment in antiquarian matters remains there. This manuscript then being thus estimated (as very old) by the German Tischendorf, was snatched away from the monastery, was afterwards transferred to Cairo, and after a few days was lent to Tischendorf, by the mediation of the Russian Consul in Egypt. And it is said that the restoration of the Codex after its publication was guaranteed by the Russian Ambassador in Constantinople. But I do not believe in any promise of the Ambassador or the Consul, for the restoration of the Codex, and even if they did promise it, I do not believe that they would ever restore it to the

monastery of Sinai. I judge from previous events. «For a Russian official (as the proverb says), a liar, and a thief, are synonymous». But let others treat of all this, as also of the arrangements, just or unjust, made by the Russian Consul and the guileful Tischendorf for the accomplishment of their purposes. I am not surprised at any of the circumstances, but only at the fact that this Codex, recent as it was, and thy handiwork, was ascribed to the fourth century. Here is a miracle forsooth, and yet people sneer at us for believing miracles! This Codex, my son, I saw several times, and particularly three of the Acrostics which thou showedst to me at Athos when I overlooked thee in that pleasant writing - room of thine. The first reads thus — Κ. Σιμωνίδου χείρ ἱπιραίωσέ με, the second - Κ. Λ. Φ. Σιμωνίδου Μακεδόνος ἔργον διάριστον εἰμί; and the third Σιμωνίδου τὸ ὅλον ἔργον. I also saw the fourth and fifth, but do not remember them now; and also calligraphic symbols, and especially the numerous corrections, and corrections again of these, and annotations both of thyself and of thy uncle, by which I recognised thy work; but I said nothing to any one, nor shall I speak of the matter till thou shalt request me; and for this reason have hastened to give thee the information in the present letter.

The Codex in question, as we are now quite certain, was transported to St. Petersburg to be published, and its antiquity was established by the learned there. Now we shall see whether they will endorse the vain talking of Tischendorf, whom I have myself seen and conversed with four times, and whom I found superficial in all things, and quite ignorant of the language of our immortal ancestors. He only chatters mechanically the Scriptures and understands their meaning by Latin versions, and not at sight; so that every ancient Greek work which has not been translated is considered by him as hard to understand, and is set down by him as being in the common Greek tongue, which the foolish critics have christened Romaic. And the questions which have been most clearly settled (about Greek palaeography) he is quite unacquainted with. In a simple word, he deceives the world by his reputation, as thou hast before remarked. Now, it is thy business to prove and proclaim the man's real character, and to show how different it is from what it appears to be.

Farewell, O son in the Lord, and fight the good fight, and write to me sometimes, that we may hear of thy good deeds in behalf of our nation, and our mother the Church, from their author, the faithful son of his country, and not from others.

Alexandria, 9 (O.S.) November of the year 1861
Thy sincere and hearty well - wisher in the Lord,
+*Kallinikos Hieromonachos*

P.S. - Remark this also, that the same man came on another occasion to the monastery of Mount Sinai in the year 1844, in the month of May, and there saw thy Codex, and secretly abstracted many leaves (as I wrote to

thee long ago) and went away undisturbed, (because, unfortunately, the librarian, who only could have reproved and exposed his wickedness, lay seriously ill, and departed shortly after to his rest in heaven). - Thine,

Kallinikos.

Markos[20] and Dorotheos and Joasaph salute thee; they are going tomorrow to Jerusalem, and thence to Damascus. I have received all thy books, and have given them to thy friends, therefore be at ease on that question. When art thou coming to Egypt? Thou knowest that they presence is urgently required. Come quickly, I entreat thee again, for we are on the eve of great affairs, as thou well knowest. In great haste.

This letter is commented on by Hodgkin (in *The Guardian* 28th January 1863).

His letter to Kallinikos in 1861 asking for further confirmation, seems to me to have been the natural act of a man desirous of making asurance doubly sure, before committing himself publicly to an assertion which he knew would call forth expressions of disbelief and derision.

Letters 3 and 4 were written after the original letter of Kallinikos published in *The Guardian* 3rd. December 1862. The third letter in the current sequence was written on November 5th (=17th) and has the following introductory note by Simonides:

In reply to my letter enclosing the Greek version of my letter to the *Guardian.*

Then follows the letter:

+My son Simonides, well-beloved in the Lord-I have perused the translation, or rather the Greek original, of thy letter to the Editor of the *Guardian* concerning the pseudo - Sinaitic Codex, and I applaud thy love of truth. But I am sorry that thou hast omitted many circumstances not essential to the subject, and I fear, on account of the brevity of thy narration, true though it be, there will be many conjectures amongst those who are doubtful of the truth of the matter. I myself have also written, as an eye - witness, to some of the journals of London concerning this question, among others to the *Guardian,* to whom I wrote as follows...(Here follows the text of the *Guardian)*[21].

Thus I wrote to the editor of the *Guardian,* and in almost similar terms to the others, copies of which letters I have by me, and will send to thee, if they should refuse to publish them (which, however, I can hardly believe); so that thou mayst publish them thyself. Farewell, my son, and inform me of current events. - Thy Spiritual Father,

+*Kallinikos Hieromonachos*

Letter four was written on the following day:

---

20. Here The Literary Churchman has (less probably) Charkos.
21. i.e. the letter published in December 1862. See p. 76 f.

+My Son in the Lord, Simonides—Yesterday, the 5th November (O.S.) of the present year I wrote to thee concisely, in which letter I copied my letter to the *Guardian,* and I hope that thou wilt receive - it safely, for I directed it as thou didst instruct me. To day it seems to me best to send thee my letter to the London *Times,* and to the *Literary Churchman,* that thou mayst have it in thy hands for who knows what a day may bring forth? So here follow the copies, and first that of the letter to the *Times.* (Here follow copies of two letters from Kallinicos to the *Times* and *Literary Churchman*) Thus, O faithful child of thy country, runs my letters to the Literary Churchman, therefore I beg thee, be earnest for their publication, that thou mayst obtain a copy, and compare it with the copy in thy hands. And if it be incorrectly translated, and then published, let me know, or else do thou publish the real text of my letter in Greek, and send me a copy of the journal; but let it be quickly, for in the new year (God willing) I shall go to Jerusalem and thence to Damascus, because the Roman Catholics and the followers of Mohammed have some evil scheme against us. But I will write to thee again from Jerusalem, and send thee the copy of the inscriptions from Bostrae, and Syria, and Palestine. Farewell again and many times, my son in the Lord, and fight the good fight, and write to thy Spiritual Father.

+*Kallinikos Hieromonachos*

Alexandria, 6 November, 1862.

As well as printing these four letters all of which survive in the Hodgkin archive in the British Library, Additional MS. 42502 volume 2, on 14th January 1863 *The Guardian* also included two letters by Hodgkin:

Sir—The originals of the four letters from Kallinikos, which Simonides forwards to you for publication, are in my possession, as he has handed them to me, to preserve for the inspection of any gentleman who may incline to examine them. I have myself given them very minute examination, and, as far as my experience in such matters goes, I have no hesitation in pronouncing them to be the genuine productions of some *one* person, and to have been written at the respective dates assigned to them. Three of them bear postmarks corresponding with the MS. dates; the fourth has been transmitted in an envelope. The handwriting is very much cramped and contracted, so as to be in places almost illegible, but I think you may rely on the translation as literal and accurate.

In conclusion I wish distinctly to remark that I simply hold these letters for the inspection of the curious in such matters, and of those interested in the question of the authenticity of the «Codex Sinaiticus», and that whilst I have given my closest and most minute attention to the examination of the external appearance, I do not wish to be understood as taking any part in the controversy but would request those who have ridiculed the statements of Simonides to come and inspect for themselves these

documents, which form, I imagine, if they are what they profess to be, an important link in the evidence.

John Eliot Hodgin

Liverpool, Jan. 3, 1863

To which is appended:

Sir—Facts are stubborn things, and one simple fact, which I happen to be in a position to establish, knocks down the beautiful theory of fraud and falsehood at the hands of Simonides which your correspondent Mr. W.A.Wright has so generously sought to establish in his letter to you of December 10[22] which I have seen to - day for the first time. Mr. Wright «has *reason to believe* that Simonides first became aware of the existence of the Codex Friderico - Augustanus on the 7th of October of the present year (1862)», and thereupon goes into arguments to prove that Simonides (whom he assumes, with a candour worthy of the rest of his letter, to be *one* with Kallinikos) had time to transmit this «newly acquired fact» to Alexandria, and for it to be returned, &c. Alas for Mr. W.A. Wright and his «reasons to believe». Simonides first saw the facsimilies of the Codex Friderico - Augustanus at my house in the spring of 1861 - some twenty months before the date so kindly set down for his first view by your correspondent. It is only the accident of my being acquainted with the fact that Simonides had seen and studied the Codex at that period which rescues him from the maliciously ingenious reasoning of Mr. Wright. So much for that gentleman, his *reasons,* and his conclusions. *Ex pede Herculem.*

I am no «thick - and - thin» partisan of Simonides. I should expose any fraud of his which I might detect with as unsparing a hand as Mr. Wright himself; but I will not see the public misled by such unscrupulous special pleading as that of your correspondent without calling attention to the fallacy, and to the *animus* which prompts it.

John Eliot Hodgin

West Derby, Jan. 3, 1863

W.A.Wright wasted no time in scrutinising Kallinikos' letters and writes of his suspicions in *The Guardian* the week later 21st. January 1863, as well as answering Hodgkin's letters:

If any one will take the trouble to read my letters to the *Guardian* carefully, he will see that the fact of Simonides having been aware of the existence of the Codex Friderico - Augustanus before October, 1862, is by no means destructive to my argument. The rest of my case is unaffected by it. We hear nothing of Tischendorf's visit to Mount Sinai in Simonides' letter written in September. We do hear it for the first time on his side in the letter of Kallinikos written at the end of October. I wanted to show the possibility of complicity between Simonides and Kallinikos, and Simonides has proved this for me beyond a doubt.

22. p. 80 f.

Permit me now to make a few remarks on the letters of Kallinikos which are printed in your journal this week. I confess I am still sceptical as to the existence of Kallinikos in the flesh. He appears to be a sort of Mrs. Harris to Simonides. The only one of his letters which possesses the least value as evidence is that bearing date 1858. About this I should wish to be further informed, and shall probably have some remarks to make next week. The others prove, what I was not certain of before, a correspondence between Simonides and Kallinikos, and entirely destroy the worth of the latter as an independent witness, in which character he at first came forward. By Simonides' own admission, they were written at his request. The first which Kallinikos wrote was not circumstantial enough: Simonides asked him to write another, and this is circumstantial with a vengeance. It is the merest echo of Simonides' own statement, but is characterised by a splenetic and venomous malignity against Tischendorf which I have never seen equalled. I submit, Sir, that this is not evidence against Tischendorf or for Simonides, but clearly proves complicity between Simonides and Kallinikos, admitting the existence of the letter. This letter is dated 9th Nov., 1861, O.S., and I would especially call your attention to the fact that it is in the *postscript* and not in the letter that Tischendorf's visit to Mount Sinai in 1844 is mentioned. I shall probably have occasion to refer to this hereafter. The silly assertion that Tischendorf knows Greek only through the medium of Latin translations may be left to refute itself. But it is precisely what Simonides said of Tischendorf at Cambridge in October last.

I find my theory that Kallinikos is a constant reader of the *Guardian* and *Literary Churchman* is without foundation. Simonides tells us that Kallinikos knows not a word of English. Why then, I ask, did he send him the strip of the *Guardian* containing his letter in English? And why does Kallinikos, in his letter of 5th (17th) November, 1862, make the awkward slip, «I have perused *the translation, or rather the Greek original,* of thy letter»? Again, why does Kallinikos, who, according to Simonides' own account, only appears to know of the letter to the *Guardian,* instantly dash off letters in defence of Simonides, not only to the *Guardian,* but to the *Times and Literary Churchman?* The difficulties in Simonides' case increase at every step. Kallinikos has already secured his retreat. He is off to Jerusalem, and is going on to Damascus. I would recommend Simonides to join him before it is too late.

Simonides complains that his ignorance of English has prevented him from answering my letters before. My first letter to the *Guardian* was published on 5th Nov., 1862. This Mr. Hodgkin does not appear to have seen. The letter of Simonides is dated 3d. Jan., 1863. Surely in two months he could have had my letter translated to him, and a translation made of his own reply. My letter was in his possession before the end of November as

appears by his own acknowledgment in your columns, dated 17th (29th) Nov., 1862. He cannot complain that he has not had time enough.

I am watching with great interest the gradual development of Simonides' story. It is interesting to mark the accretions by which the simplicity of his original narrative is being disfigured.

W.A. Wright

Obviously the most important letter of the four is the one of 1858, that is, before Tischendorf's discovery of Codex Sinaiticus. The authenticity of the letter and the independence of Kallinikos as a witness were obviously matters which critics of Simonides needed to verify. The editor of *The Guardian* added the following footnote to the publication of the letters:

An independent and sufficient witness to the credibility as well as the existence of Callinicus, is the thing wanted. Mr. Simonides does not supply that want by producing additional letters purporting to come from Callinicus himself. Mr. Hodgkin's two letters[23],taken together, are certainly an amusing specimen of a very Irish mode of «not taking part in a controversy». - ED. G.

In view of this comment Hodgkin made a reply in the following week's paper:

Sir–At the risk of again «amusing» you, I venture to suggest that you have hardly appreciated at its true value the bearing of the letters which you have published in your last impression.

Permit me very briefly to recall to your recollection the facts. A letter vouching for the truth of the narrative of Simonides reached you from Alexandria. Correspondents hostile to Simonides at once suggested that the professed author of that letter, Kallinikos, was no other than Simonides himself in disguise, and ingenious calculations were entered into to prove that there had been time for him, since he had been put upon his trial in England, to send out instructions to Egypt, and to have the forged voucher for his veracity returned to you. On the face of it, one would say that such a device, if resorted to, was the sudden and improvised expedient of an almost desperate man.

But at this point of the controversy turn up no less than four letters from the same Kallinikos (bearing the same signature, at any rate, as the recent letter to the *Literary Churchman*, as I can testify myself), written at various dates from the year 1858 to 1861[24]and giving evidence by their post - marks of having been really posted at those dates. I submit that the fact of the existence of these letters, *all certainly written by the same person*, whoever he may be, and especially of the letter dated August 5 (17), 1858, long before the publication of Tischendorf's statement as to his discovery of the «Codex Sinaiticus» throws fresh light upon the whole question, and should secure for the Hieromonachos a more respectful hearing than some of your correspondents are disposed to allow him.

23. p. 91 f.
24. This should of course read 1862.

Whether my last letters to you were «Irish» in their character I will not now discuss. I can only say that nothing but the English love of fair play first led me to inquire into the character and history of a man whom for years I knew of only as «the notorious Simonides», but whom subsequent investigation showed me to be oppressed by the unfair treatment of antagonists.

To the same instinctive love of justice on your part I appeal, to give the facts recently brought forward whatever weight they really deserve; and repeating that I shall be most happy to exhibit the original letters to any reader of your paper, clerical or lay, who may favour me with a call here - I am, yours truly,

John Eliot Hodgin

West Derby, near Liverpool.

But we learn from the following week's issue of *The Guardian* (4th February 1863) from W.A. Wright that as far as he is concerned Hodgkin has not been helpful:

I regret that Mr. Hodgkin declines to give me a description of the letter of Kallinikos, which bears date 1858. I have now no opportunity of examining it, and must ask any of your readers who have seen it to favour me with an accurate account of it, especially as to whether it is written on one leaf or on two.

The Christian Remembrance July 1863 regrets that Hodgkin declined to exhibit this letter to Wright. The reason for this request - and the refusal - becomes clearer several months later when Hodgkin in *The Guardian,* 22nd July 1863, refers to Kallinikos' letter of 1858 and comments on the false impression given by *The Christian Remembrance* about Hodgkin's apparent obstructiveness. In defending himself and Simonides, he gives his reasons for his behaviour:

Sir — I wish to make a few remarks under the above well—worn heading, on a subject which deeply concerns myself—viz., my «championship», as it is called, of Simonides. I shall be gladly indebted to your courtesy for the publication of my letter, which I will condense as much as possible.

One of my friends showed my yesterday an article in the *Christian Remembrancer* for July, headed *Constantine Simonides and his Biblical Studies,* containing two statements which I wish to correct, though made by a writer of whose tone as regards myself I have in order respects no cause to complain.

The first is unimportant, but may as well be set straight: I did *not* accompany Simonides to Cambridge last year, as is stated on p. 201; if I had done so, I should have been able to correct at the time Mr. W.A. Wright's idea that Simonides was up to that date unacquainted with the Codex Friderico - Augustanus.

The other statement of which I have to complain, as hardly giving a fair impression of my conduct, even though it may be literally correct, is the

following, on p. 206—«This leaf, we are sorry to be obliged to add, Mr. Hodgkin at first declined to exhibit». It seems to be suggested that I had suspicions of the genuineness of this leaf, and withheld it, while producing its companions. The fact is, as I think I sufficiently explained in my letter to you of February 14[25] that on a certain evening, at a meeting of the Royal Society of Literature, I declined to produce, not that leaf only, but the whole of the four letters which were called for, I thought somewhat imperiously, by Mr. W.A. Wright. I admit that I was annoyed at the scant civility shown to the defenders of the claims of Simonides by his opponents, and I thought that the jury empannelled to try the cause showed signs of something like a foregone conclusion. Under these circumstances, I did what was equivalent to moving a new trial. I declined to produce the letters *there and then*, but placed them at once (*vide* my letter to you dated February 14) in responsible hands in London (the Rev. W.J. Irons, D.D., Brompton), suggesting at the same time that not merely amateur investigation should be pursued, but that an *expert* should be employed to examine them.

I see that some gentleman who has looked at the letters has made the observation, which was patent to any close observer, that the paper of the letters on the single leaf was folded before the letter was written, but he has not carried his observation far enough, or he would have also discovered that the letter written on a *whole sheet*, not enclosed in an envelope, but bearing the proper post-marks, and which *must* have come in its present state from Alexandria, has *also* been written *after* the paper was folded, in accordance, as I am informed by a Greek gentleman, with the common practice in the East. This fact, coupled with the circumstances that all the letters are in the same handwriting, warranted my original assertion, that they appeared to be «the genuine productions of one person, and written at the dates assigned to them». I do not press this view *now*, as the subject has become much more involved and difficult since I thus wrote, but it is necessary that I should show that I acted, not only with good faith, but after an examination even more minute than that of subsequent observers. One single circumstance I have noticed, since the meeting, in connection with these letters, to which no one has called attention, which I cannot explain by any theory, and which time alone can clear up. I will fully allude to it when I obtain the information referred to below.

And now you must allow me, once for all, to put myself right with the literary public as to the nature of my «defence» of Simonides. It has been an occupation unsought by and not congenial to me, sometimes even irksome; but whatever I have done, I have felt it my duty to do—a duty, in the first instance, to one who was thrown in my path, assailed on all sides, apparently innocent of the charges brought against him, a foreigner and

25. See p. 99 f.

nearly friendless, and who could not understand, except through the medium of his own language, a quarter of the statements adverse to his pretensions with which the papers teemed. The feelings, however, which now mainly urge me to do my part towards obtaining him a fair hearing in the many causes in which he has contrived to get himself arraigned at the bar of public opinion are the persuasion that his pretensions have at any rate too much plausibility and show of truth to be silenced by declamation, and the assurance that full discussion will soonest elicit the truth. If Simonides have *(sic)* spoken falsely, he will in the end most assuredly convict himself, and Mr. W.A. Wright and I, if we are engaged in eliciting facts and not mere theories, are not antagonists, but are working towards one end — truth. My action has hitherto been principally confined to stating such facts as I could really vouch for, and to putting Simonides as far as I could in the position he would have held could he have understood our language. But I believe that I possess clues which, properly followed up, may lead to the entire removal of many of our doubts. Perhaps it is too much to expect that we shall ever really get at the whole truth on both sides. I am now waiting information from the East from sources unknown to Simonides, which should produce a definite result; and any reliable statements shall be made public as early as possible. If it turns out that the assertion made by Simonides that *he* wrote the Codex Sinaiticus, wild though it seems, is correct, I shall be glad that I have done my part towards the development of the inquiry; yet I shall do my best towards testing the truth of his every declaration. And there is not a man in England who will have more right or more inclination than myself to unite in the chorus of indignation which will for ever pursue him, should he be eventually proved, after all his protestation, to be guilty of the imposture of which he is now virtually accussed.

John Eliot Hodgkin

In reply to this (*Guardian* 29th, July 1863) Wright reports on the information gleaned from Hodgkin:

After the four letters of Callinicus had appeared in the *Guardian*, I wrote to Mr. Hodgkin asking him which of the four had no postmarks upon it. Your readers will remember that in Mr. Hodgkin's letter which accompanied them it was stated that three of the letters had genuine postmarks corresponding to the internal dates; the fourth was in an envelope. I received from Mr. Hodgkin a most courteous reply, to the effect that the one which had no postmarks was that bearing date 1861, but that the most important of all—namely, that of August, 1858—inasmuch as it was written before the announcement of Tischendorf's discovery, had postmarks corresponding to the internal date.

And then goes on to make a shrewd guess:

Mr. Hodgkin assured me at the same time of his perfect willingness to

give me every information in his power, and concluded with these words - «You may remember that you have in me, not a devoted partisan of the Greek, but an earnest and careful seeker after truth». I was encouraged by this to ask one question with regard to the letter if 1858—«Is it on one leaf or two?» I believe I also begged Mr. Hodgkin to give me a minute description of the letters, as I was unable to go to Liverpool to see them for myself. To this he replied, «I must ask you to excuse me from giving the minute description of the letters you ask for». After the meeting of the Royal Society of Literature, I repeatedly pressed Mr. Hodgkin to tell me whether the letter of 1858 was on one leaf or two, and he as constantly declined to tell me. There were many who heard our conversation, and can bear witness to this. I have not had an opportunity of examining the letter myself, but I have been informed that it is, as I guessed from the first, *on one leaf*. I will hazard a further guess - that that leaf was originally the blank leaf of an old letter which had genuine postmarks on the back. That the writing which is now upon it was put there after the paper was folded Mr. Hodgkin himself admits. The evidence of the expert as to the writing in the four letters being the same supports my theory as well as his.

I have no intention to enter into a controversy with Mr. Hodgkin, and so divert attention from the main point at issue. I believe him to be as sincere as myself in the view which he has adopted, and shall await with interest the result of his inquiries in the East. If there was anything imperious or peremptory in my manner to him at the meeting of the Royal Society of Literature, it was quite unintentional, and I offer him publicly a frank and full apology.

As well as writing this Wright also gives reasons for further suspicion about Kallinikos:

There is one point with regard to Callinicus to which I should like to call attention. It is important, and has not hitherto been remarked. It is this, that in the first letter (published in the *Guardian* of Sept. 3, 1862) in which Simonides put forth his claim as the writer of the Codex Sinaiticus, and appealed for confirmation of the truth of his statement to several eye—witnesses, among others to John Prodromos, who kept a coffeehouse at Galata, Callinicus is not once mentioned. Simonides was at this time, be it remembered, if his account be true in possession of two most important letters of Callinicus bearing directly upon the point—those namely of August, 1858, and November, 1861—and yet he does not appeal to them. I think this a most significant fact, and a consideration of it will go far to explain the phenomenon of the letters themselves.

W. Aldis Wright

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Shortly after the four letters of Kallinikos appeared, Tregelles also sided with Wright, by writing to *The Guardian* 11th. February 1863:

So far from Simonides and his assistants having any doubt, at the date of the «Memoir» August, 1859, of the genuineness of the MS. discovered by Tischendorf, that he or they (Memoir, p. 61) cite the finding of this MS. as a proof of the manner in which parchments may be preserved. «M. Tissendorf also lately discovered in a certain monastery in Egypt the Old Testament and part of the New, as well as the First Book of Hermas, all of which were written in the second century, or 1,750 years ago. This MS. is represented to be in excellent condition». They gave a somewhat inaccurate account of the MS., and where it was found; but *then* they wished to *add* to its antiquity instead of denying it altogether. Now, however, we are told (*Guardian* Jan. 14), «Having seen in the *Standard* of Monday, May 23, 1859, an account of the discovery at Mount Sinai, I wrote to Kallinikos on the subject and received from him a letter... This letter, however, not being sufficiently explicit, *especially as regards the identification of the newly found Codex with my own,* I wrote», &c.

I need, I suppose, waste no words to *prove* that up to August, 1859, Simonides and his coadjutors had no suspicion but that Tischendorf had really discovered a very ancient Codex; he could not, therefore, have been writing to Callinicus in the way of setting aside the discovery—of the particulars of which he then knew so little.

We have already seen from the correspondence in July that Wright and Hodgkin had had a personal confrontation over the Kallinikos letters. The first we heard of this conflict was in Feburary when Hodgkin reported in detail what had taken place at the Royal Society of Literature. This appeared in *The Guardian* 18th. February 1863.

Sir - During the meeting last Wednesday of the Royal Society of Literature, I was called on, in a peremptory manner, by Mr. W.A. Wright. to exhibit the four letters signed «Kallinikos Hieromonachos» which were committed to my charge. I declined to *obey* Mr. Wright, and offered to give my reasons for this course, which, however, the meeting did not seem to require. With your permission I will briefly state the most important of them, the others being of a personal nature connected with the character of a private correspondence with me which Mr. W. A. Wright had commenced.

I considered, and still consider, the course adopted by the Royal Society of Literature, at their last meeting, to be a most unfair and un - English one. At a meeting ostensibly convened for the reception of a report of the council on the Mayer Papyri[26] professedly unrolled by Simonides, which was sure to challenge a vigorous reply from those who held the arguments of that body to be weak and one - sided, it was attempted to preclude the healthy discussion of that report, by the immediate introduction of a paper by Mr. W. A. Wright on the Codex Sinaiticus, the simple object of which

26. For a discussion of the Mayer Papyri see pp. 131-163.

appeared to be to shake the faith of the public in the personal character of Simonides. A very strong clique attempted to rule that this paper should be read before the discussion on the Mayer Papyri could take place, but the desire of fair play was so strong among some of the neutral party that the meeting condescended to allow the report of the council to be discussed first, though the controversy was much curtailed by the eagerness of the friends of the Codex Sinaiticus, for the paper which was to throw discredit on the pretensions of Simonides. This paper was read, and personal evidence was called in support of it, which I believe I only speak the feeling of the meeting in describing as extremely discreditable.

After the meeting, I had some conversation with Mr. W. A. Wright, the result of which was that I promised to examine still more minutely the handwriting. I have done this, and feel that the controversy has now reached a stage at which it is best for me no longer to retain the guardianship of the four letters, but to place them still more easily within the reach of those gentlemen who may wish to examine them. I send them, therefore, to the Rev. W. J. Irons, D.D., Brompton, who has kindly consented to take charge of them - not as editor of the *Literary Churchman* (in which character some one addressed him in error at the meeting on Wednesday), but because he has taken so great an interest in the matter during the illness of the editor of that journal, that he has a comprehensive view of the merits of the case.

I would beg those gentlemen who examine these letters, to give them their earnest and minute attention, and considering the great importance of the issue, to weigh calmly and seriously the various qrestions which may arise during their scrutiny. And I think that the judgment of some *perfectly unbiassed* and competent expert should be obtained if possible.

John Eliot Hodgkin

The investigation of the authenticity of the letters took two forms. The first investigation took its cue from Wright's suspicion that Simonides could have written the first letter to be printed and had it sent to England from Alexandria. This investigation in fact took place at the Royal Society of Literature's February meeting and it is significant that the investigation and the result are absent from Hodgkin's letter. The extra details are provided by W.S.W. Vaux in the same issue of *The Guardian:*

Sir—I venture to think that must be some limit to the controversy with respect to Simonides and his deeds, which has been now carried to considerable length in your columns, and that certain facts elicited at the meeting of the Royal Society of Literature on last Wednesday evening, Feburary 11, afford this limit.

On this occasion, Sir Henry Rawlinson, K.C.B., being in the chair, a report from the council of the society was read, strongly condemnatory of the genuineness of the whole of the papyri from Mr. Mayer's museum at Liverpool, which Simonides has unrolled and published recently, under the

title of *Facsimiles,* etc.; and though Simonides and his friends professed indignation at this statement, no effective answer was given during the ensuing discussion to any of the charges advanced in that report.

At the conclusion of the report, a paper was read by Mr. W. Aldis Wright on the Codex Sinaiticus, in which, while giving a brief account of the means by which Tischendorf procured it, he gave a refutation to the pretensions of Simonides such as that person had evidently not expected.

Mr. Wright laid upon the table the original of the letter of Callinicus Hieromonachus, which had, apparently, been written at Alexandria, and which had certainly been sent thence to the *Guardian* office by the ordinary post. Mr. Wright proved, by comparison of the writing of this letter with other known specimens of the handwriting of Simonides, that the letter of Callinicus *must have been written by Simonides himself in England and sent hence to some one in Alexandria, who posted it to the Guardian.*

Now, Sir, I submit that, this being so, there ought to be no further discussion about Simonides, and that no attention should be paid to any future assertions of either himself or his friends. We have it now as a *fact,* which any person of ordinary intelligence can decide for himself, that Simonides has attempted to maintain his assertion that he wrote the Codex Sinaiticus, *by means of a letter which he has himself forged.*

I may add that the Rev. Mr. Nicolaides[27], recently minister of the Greek Church in Liverpool, in whose house Simonides lived for some months, declared publicly, on the same evening, in the presence of Simonides, that the letter of Callinicus and the other documents Mr. Wright exhibited with them, were all in one and the same handwriting – viz., that of Simonides.

W.S.W. Vaux

The Christian Remembrancer July 1863 comments on this:

Mr. Wright obtained possession of Callinicos' epistle dated October 27, and of one professedly by Simonides himself, which he shewed together at the meeting of the Royal Society of Literature on February 11. Those of Callinicos and Simonides were written on the same kind of paper; the English writing in the address of the letter of Callinicos was identical with

27. Mr Nicolaides turns out to be another enemy which Simonides made. See Simonides' explanation in The Literary Churchman 16th March 1863:

Thou must know that the false witness who rose up against me, by name Nicolaides, was excommunicated some time ago by the Holy Synod of Greece, for sufficient reasons, well known to the Greeks in Liverpool. And, further, that he was imprisoned by the order of the Patriarch of Constantinople - Anthimos, in the prisons of M. Athos; and escaped thence, after no short confinement, at the time of the Anglo-Gallo-Russian war.

I lodged with him only some 11 weeks only, and not 16 months; and was engaged in annotating the Commentary of Theotokes, which he was translating into English. Many of my scholia were published in Greek, in the first volume, one of which still bears my signature, «K. S.». These were also appended originally to the other scholia, but were erased by this man, as is known by the firm who printed the book in Liverpool. I never received any recompense for this my labour.

the English handwriting in *another* letter written by Simonides: The Greek of Callinicos' letter was identical with certain Greek writing known to be Simonides'. May we not conclude that Simonides and Callinicos are one?

So too does *The Literary Churchman* which despite the apparently damning evidence against the separate existence of Kallinikos tries to find mitigating circumstances.

> A paper of much ability on the subject of the «SINAITIC MS.» itself was read by Mr. W. A. Wright. It brought out very clearly, as we thought, the identity of the handwriting of the letters addressed to us by Callinicus, and that of Simonides himself; so much so, that we feel persuaded that Callinicus must have had his letters copied before sending them to England for publication. Mr. Wright had examined the details with sagacity and care rarely equalled; and every one must feel indebted to him for his zeal and determination in this matter.

This somewhat illogical editorial comment of 16th February 1863 makes sense only if Simonides was the copier.

In the same issue of *The Literary Churchman* Simonides expostulates by threatening a lawsuit against Wright:

> *To the Editor of the «Literary Churchman»*
>
> SIMONIDES SENDS GREETING
>
> It is true that I understood, at the time, almost nothing of the arguments which, against truth, against probability, and with bitter feeling, were urged against me, at the meeting of the Royal Soc. Literature, by my enemies of the British Museum; so that I gave no reply, though I had a great deal to say. I will now answer concisely, and will give a categorical reply if the Secretary of the Society will furnish me with a copy of the Report.
>
> Thou knowest that nothing reasonable was advanced by my opponents, and that their arguments are held as vain by those who are not of their school; and that the Chairman finally dissolved the meeting without anything definite having been *proved,* either about the Papyri or the Codex Pseudo - Sinaiticus, although the Report of the Council was very decided, containing many things which I can show from the printed Report, to proceed from men not thoroughly acquainted with the matters of which they wrote.
>
> I shall confirm the genuineness of the letters of Kallinikos by convincing proof, and then I shall prosecute Mr. W. A. Wright for libel; for, as is said in the writings of the ancients.
>
> «παιδεύετε τοὺς ἀτάκτους, ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωνται»

Neither the convincing proof nor the libel suit are produced. It is interesting to see that added to the list of Simonides' many enemies is the staff of the British Museum.

THE SEARCH FOR KALLINIKOS

While all this was taking place a second form of investigation into the ex-

istence of Kallinikos was being undertaken. This occurred not in the literary world of London, but in the Middle East. J. Silvester Davies formerly acting British Chaplain at Alexandria, working on a query raised by W. A. Wright tried to locate Kallinikos in Alexandria.

This search began as early as December 1862 only a few weeks after Kallinikos' original letter had appeared. In *The Guardian* 17th December 1862 Davies broached the subject and expressed the need for such an enquiry.

> Sir—It is a pity that M. Simonides has not placed us more perfectly *en rapport* with his old friend Kallinikos. He was at Athos about 1840, and subsequently, and is now apparently in the Greek convent at Alexandria. Here, surely, we may learn something of him. He must be a man easily traceable, from his knowledge of the English language, being, apparently, a «reader» of the *Guardian,* and thus having «unasked» sent you a defence of Simonides. English is by no means common among Greek ecclesiastics.
>
> I never met with one who would speak a word of it. And it is strange that when some of the Greek priests of Alexandria and myself desired easy communication, this learned monk should not have been thought of. I fear I must still doubt your having a reader among the Greek monks; but there are English readers of your paper on the spot who can make the matter clear with a very little trouble. We want some *certain* information about this Hieromonachos Kallinikos of Alexandria.
>
> *J. Silvester Davies*

The next we hear of this is on 4th. February 1863 (in *The Guardian* and repeated in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* July 1863).

> Sir—I cannot at present trace the existence of the Hieromonachos Kallinikos at Alexandria, though he must be there, or have been there quite recently, since letters from him to Simonides are dated from Alexandria so late as November, 1862.
>
> But I hear that there is a Hieromonachos Kallinikos at Mount Sinai, an *old* man, and respected.
>
> Other inquiries are being made, which I trust may throw light on this strange controversy.
>
> *J. Silvester Davies*

Silvester Davies then wrote via the British chaplain in Alexandria, Edwin J. Davis, to Kallinikos of Sinai. This letter is reproduced in *The Guardian* 27th May. 1863.

> Sir—I am now in a position to place before the public direct evidence from Mount Sinai which will, I think, conclude the case against Simonides, and convict him, in the eyes of all reasonable men, of direct forgery. The first of the following letters is a copy of one which I wrote to the venerable Kallinikos' Hieromonk of Sinai, and which was kindly forwarded by the Revd. Edwin J. Davis, Consular Chaplain of Alexandria. I send you the let-

ter entire, in order that the answer of the Hieromonk, of which I give the original and a translation, may be more clearly cunderstood:

«*To the Hieromonk Kallinikos at the Convent of Mount Sinai,* Grace, mercy, and peace &c.

Reverend Sir—It is known to you that the celebrated critic Dr. Tischendorf has obtained from the library of the Convent on Mount Sinai a codex of the Sacred Scripture, which he assigns to a very early date.

It may also be known to you that the skilful palaeographist Constantine Leonidas Photius Simonides has astonished those who are interested in this matter, by putting forward a claim to the authorship of the Codex, which Dr. Tischendorf is now publishing to the world as a work probably of the fourth century.

It is a matter of greatest importance that the truth should be known: and the question can, doubtless, be settled on the evidence of the MS. itself. Several letters, however, have appeared in English journals (e.g. the *Guardian* and the *Literary Churchman*) bearing your honoured name, in which letters is contained a defence of the claim of Simonides to be the author of this Sinaitic Codex. Pardon, then, rev. sir, the liberty I take in addressing you in the name of many others in England who are interested in the result of this controversy. We would beg of you kindly to inform us whether *you know personally* this Dr. Constantine Leonidas Photius Simonides – whether *you wrote the letters from Alexandria* to which I have referred, and which you cannot fail to remember if you wrote them. Further, we would inquire *whether Simonides is himself known to have visited Mount Sinai;* and if so, *whether he visited it in 1844, or in 1852*. We have been led to suspect (1) that the letters bearing your signature are forgeries by C. Simonides; and (2) that Simonides himself was never at Sinai.

By informing us on these points you will merit our humble thanks, and the cause of truth will be helped; and all those will thank you who are zealous for Biblical learning.

Kindly write back to me again. Farewell in the Lord.—Wholly and sincerely your devoted servant,

J. Silvester Davies,

Priest of the English Church, now of Southampton, lately of Alexandria.

Written at Southampton, England, Feb. 25, 1863.

My friend the Priest Edwin J. Davis, British Consular Chaplain at Alexandria, who forwards to you this letter, will also transmit your welcome reply.

As a result of this a letter from Kallinikos of Sinai appeared and is also reproduced in the same issue of *The Guardian.* (It also appeared in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* July 1863 and in a slightly different form in *The Literary Churchman* 1st. June 1863). The Greek is given first, then the following translation:

To the Most Venerable Priest, J. Silvester Davies, of Southampton, England.

From the Monastery of Mount Sinai, 1 (13) April, 1863[28].

Most pious and by me most respected Sir—I received the valuable letter, brought to me from you, written at Southampton on February 25 of this same year, in which you ask me, in the first place, whether the letters published in several English journals under the signature «Kallinikos Hieromonachos» and defending Mr. Simonides, are indeed my letters or not; secondly, whether the said Mr. Simonides ever visited the Monastery of Mount Sinai.

In answer to your first question I reply, that besides myself there is no other Kallinikos Hieromonachus in this holy monastery. But I lived away from the monastery from the year 1838 to 1855, having been sent on different monastic services to Damascus, Rhodes, and elsewhere; and never anywhere have I made acquaintance with any Simonides. Since, then, there is no other Kallinikos Hieromonachos besides myself among the brethren of this monastery, and I have never known any Simonides, and consequently I did not write the aforesaid letters to shield him in his tricks, it follows that these letters have been forged by Simonides himself.

To answer your second question, I sought to know for certain from my aged and long - standing brethren, whether they remembered any one called Simonides having come up to Mount Sinai, and having visited our holy monastery: and they all expressly assured me in the negative, that certainly never did any Simonides appear in this monastery. One of the brethren declared to me above all, that in the year 1852 being at Alexandria, he saw Mr. Simonides, who had landed there with the view of going thence to Damietta and Upper Egypt. But suddenly, without going anywhere, he went to England, having embarked in the ship *Kasion,* Captain Nicolas Maliaraki.

Since, then, Mr. Simonides never visited Mount Sinai, but having only just come to Alexandria immediately went thence to England; he lies when he positively affirms that the ancient MS. of the Holy Scripture published by Mr. Tischendorf is his work; because the MS. in question (as the librarian of our holy monastery, having been so from the year 1841 to 1858, assured me) belonged to the library of the monastery, and was marked in its ancient catalogues. The book then, which the librarian who was appointed in 1841 found in this library, how could it possibly be the work of Simonides, who never set foot on Mount Sinai, but only got as far as Alexandria in 1852, and went back directly from thence without having visited another part of Egypt? In every way, then, the assertion of Simonides is proved false, when he says that ancient MS. was his work.

As to myself, if the great distance of place and my own advanced years

28. The writing of this letter on this date is made much of later (see p. 109).

permitted, I would willingly deliver him over to the righteous dealing of the laws as having abused me, and forged under my name those letters to prop up his great charlatanism - Accept, sir, my unfeigned respect, with which I am your sincere friend,

Kallinikos
Hieromonachos of Sinai

Such, Sir, is the letter of the «old man, and very near to death» (*Literary Churchman*, Dec. 16, 1862)[29] whom Simonides has injured and in doing so prepared his own fall. We *have* now given the Hieromonachos «a respectful hearing»; we believe him to be (as I mentioned some weeks ago after information from Alexandria) «a perfectly upright and honourable man, well known for truth and probity, so that his simplest word may be relied on» (Simonides' words, *Guardian*, Dec. 10, 1862)[30]. What will Simonides now say? The original letter of Kallinikos shall be at the service of those who desire to examine it.

J. Silvester Davies

Woolston, Southampton, May 22, 1863.

The Christian Remembrancer July 1863 points out that the Greek of Kallinikos of Sinai is less classical than that of Kallinikos of Alexandria.

When Wright demonstrated the unity of the writing between Simonides' letters and the original letter of Kallinikos of Alexandria this matter was neglected. However the evidence of Kallinikos of Sinai appeared to destroy the validity of Simonides' greatest ally. *The Literary Churchman* 16th June 1863 is nevertheless unconvinced:

> The tone of triumph against Simonides, adopted by some of our contemporaries on the publication of a supposed letter from Kallinikos, is, to say the least, premature, and will hardly do credit to their reputation for «English fairness». We confess that we were surprised at Mr. Davies' ready acceptance of the statement, that there was no other «Kallinikos». But this was not the only suspicious particular in the too round and complete document which was to expose Simonides. For ourselves, we resolved to maintain our neutrality. Scripture criticism is too sacred to be roughly handled, as some off - hand persons are handling it. Simonides may be as bad as Tischendorf says, or Tischendorf as bad as Simonides; but we pause for evidence.

At this point Simonides jumped to his own defence–yet again–first in a letter to *The Literary Churchman* 16th. June 1863 (and repeated in *The Guardian* 17th June 1863 and *The Journal of Sacred Literature).*

29. p. 77.
30. p. 80.

I am at a loss to know whether this gentleman has been grossly imposed upon or not. But two things are perfectly clear—1st, that the negative testimony of a *Kallinikos of Sinai,* whose name I have never heard, and of whose existence I am doubtful, to the effect that he did not write the letters of *Kallinikos of Athos,* only proves the folly of those who wrote to the wrong individual; 2nd, that the letter, of which you have published a copy, is not such as would be written by a person holding the position which the correspondent of Mr. Davies is supposed to hold. The Kallinikos who addressed the letters to the London papers on the subject of the Codex «Sinaiticus» is a Thessalonian by birth; his ancestors spring from the town of Niaousta, in Macedonia, and are related to General Karatasus. He was born in the year 1802,[1] and named *Kyriakos.* He took the name of Kallinikos on his admission to the church; and having taken an active part in the Greek Revolution, received the surname of *Keraunos,* on account of his bravery. He then ceased (as is necessary, according to our ecclesiastical law, in cases wherein a priest has taken up arms), from the profession of public sacerdotal duties, and spent a long time in a monastery of Mt. Athos, where I made his acquaintance. Since this time he has been engaged in semi—political missions, and I have had *continued correspondence* with him. He has travelled through Europe, Asia, and part of Africa, and the whole of the Archipelago, *and has published at Moscow and at Odessa a number of my letters to him upon Archaeological matters.*[31] What has my friend in common with the Kallinikos of Sinai? whose knowledge of the events which have occurred in his monastery seems to have been derived from a seventeen years' *absence*—(see his statement, that he lived away from his monastery from 1838 to 1855)—verily nothing at all. But because it suits Mr. Davies' purpose, he first discovers that there is a man of the same name as my correspondent at Mt. Sinai, takes great pains to inform us that he is «as honourable man», and then, after a long interval, prints his information, to the effect that he is quite ignorant of the matters about which he is asked. He may now, perhaps, find another Kallinikos at Cairo, or at Damascus, or where not? *The name is not an unusual one.*

The Archbishop even of Mt. Sinai is named Kallinikos—the late Patriarch of Alexandria was named Kallinikos—and there are several of the same name in Mt. Athos, each of whom may write him another letter, assuring him that he did not write the letters to Simonides, and that «therefore (mark the logic) they have been forged by Simonides»! It is clear that Mr. Davies must have considered that there was but one Kallinikos in the East, and that it was immaterial where he resided, so that he could be brought to deny that he wrote the letters which *were* written in reality by my friend Kallinikos of Mt. Athos.

It is not surprising that this Kallinikos should have been unable to hear

31. Copies of these are in the Bodleian Library, Oxford 1. Δ. 598 and Byw. 1.6.4.

of my three visits to Mt. Sinai from his brethren, for two reasons—1st, that divers of the monks are continually replaced by others, and are in turn sent to the possessions of the monastery in Russia, Wallachia, Bulgaria, &c. Only some twenty or thirty monks are retained at Mt. Sinai; and so great are the changes, that on my second visit I only saw two of the same faces which I had seen during my first stay. 2nd: I was at Mt. Athos for political reasons, and was habited as a monk, and was known as Sophronius, and not as Simonides. These matters would be well understood by those who know the peculiar relations of the Greeks, Roman Catholics, and Turks in those regions, but may be incomprehensible to some of your readers.

I emphatically deny that the Codex Sinaiticus was inscribed in the Ancient Catalogue, for the good reason that *no ancient catalogue exists;* there was none there whatever, till I made a catalogue, during my *first* visit, for the Patriarch of Constantinople, Constantius, who before was Archbishop of Mount Sinai.

I have now said perhaps enough about the non-identity of Mr. Davies' Kallinikos and my own, though I shall be happy to give any further information which may be required as to my friend, or to satisfy any gentleman who has visited Mount Sinai, of the correctness of my assertions as to my three visits to the monastery there.

And now I must enlighten the public a little about the style of the letters of the new Kallinikos. I say, *that they are not the work of a genuine Hieromonachos living in his monastery,* for these reasons:
1st, That they are not marked with the sign of the *cross* at the beginning and end, which is the ancient and universal custom; 2nd, It is not lawful for any of the clergy of the Greek Church to give titles of veneration to the ministers of any congregation not recognised by our church, and whoever does so is liable to severe punishment. Your readers may inform themselves upon this point by consulting Mr. Curzon's «Monasteries of the Levant». I have not the book at hand to refer to, but I remember that an instance is given therein of the ignorance of high titles in the English Church professed by Greek ecclesiastics; 3rd, It is not allowed to any monk, *who is in residence at his monastery,* to receive any letter from, or send any letter to any correspondent, either father or mother, unless the *hegoumenos* of the monastery first read such letters or reply. If an attempt is discovered to evade this regulation, the letters are burnt. *All letters which leave the monastery* bear, or ought to bear, the autograph note of approval of the *hegoumenos.* For the monks are supposed to have renounced the world and its relationships, and to need no intercourse with the outer life, and many a time epistles from father or mother, secretly given, have been discovered and forcibly taken away. The whole monastery is like a garrison, and this increases the difficulty of sending letters surreptitiously; 4th, The *style* of the letter is quite complimentary, and not in accordance with ecclesiastical gravity. The writer certainly answers with great good nature, exactly in the

tone which he could not fail to see, from the beseeching tenor of Mr. Davies' letter, would be agreeable to his correspondent; but he goes too far in politeness when he makes use of the expression quite foreign to the tongue of a Greek ecclesiastic: «Δέχθητε, κύριε, τὴν εἰλικρινῆ ὑπολει(η)ψίν μου, μεθ' ἧς διατελῶ πρόθυμος φίλος σας Κ.Ι.Σ.»

That these are not genuine Greek expressions, but *English or French compliments translated into our tongue,* one need not be a Greek to perceive; and, indeed, the whole letter bears evident marks of *translation from a foreign language;* 5th, I beg your readers to observe what has doubtless escaped Mr. Davies' notice, viz. the *date* of his correspondent's letter—*the first of April* (13th, N.S.). The first of April and its absurdities are perpetuated in Greece with *far* more freedom than in Europe. It is the great day for amusing deceptions and delusions; the day on which hoaxes of all sorts are perpetrated, and no man, either clerical or lay, who wished to be believed, would dream of dating his letter «the first of April». If he unwittingly did so, he would still not get his countrymen to believe he was in earnest. I cannot tell *who* is the deceiver in the present instance; but there can be no doubt that some one is enjoying a hearty laugh at the expense of the readers of the *Guardian.*

All this time too, the real test of the genuineness of the Codex «Sinaiticus» is neglected. The public were were assured that in *May* Tischendorf was to be in London, armed with a portion at least of his great Codex. I have waited in England hoping to have the opportunity of meeting him, face to face, to prove him in error; but May has come and gone, and the discoverer has not appeared.

Let the favourers of the antiquity of the MS. persuade him to come at once, and brave the ordeal, or else for ever hold his peace.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

C. Simonides

Commenting on this letter, *The Christian Remembrancer* July 1863 points out the following problems:

1. Mr. Davies' Callinicos of Sinai is quite a different person from his own correspondent, the Hieromonk, Callinicus of Athos, born in 1802 distinguished by the surname of *Keraunos,* for his bravery in the Greek Revolution and since engaged in semi – political missions throughout the East. *Where he now is does not appear.* So that the «old man, awaiting death daily» is only sixty, and though so eminent is utterly unknown to his brethren at Alexandria from which city he wrote in November 1861, in October and November, 1862.

2. It is not surprising that Callinicos of Sinai could hear nothing of his visits *(now said to be three)* to Mount Sinai, as the residents as the convent are perpetually changing, and because «I was at Athos for political reasons, and was habited as a monk, and was known as Sophronius and not as

Simonides». He would have us infer, *but will not actually assert,* that he was known at Sinai also under the name of Sophronius; and claims no acquaintance with *the Librarian,* who (however others might change) held that office continuously from 1841 to 1858, and yet knows nothing about him.

3. The letter of Callinicos published by Mr. Davies bears marks of not having come from a Greek monastery at all. Of his five reasons for this suspicion, four admit of easy and obvious answers; the last, on which he dwells with great zest, is much the most cogent. The Sinai epistle is dated April 13, New Style: this is April 1, Old Style, or *the Greek April fool's day.*

M. Simonides will find that such letters as this can avail nothing for his desperate case. In Greece he may still be known as «the living enigma, the Gordian knot». In the West the enigma is solved, the knot is cut. The day has gone by when we can any longer echo Wordsworth's curiously apposite prayer:

«O ye who patiently explore
The wreck of Herculanean lore,
What rapture! could ye seize
Some Theban fragment, or unroll
One precious tender—hearted scroll,
Of pure Simonides,
That were, indeed, a genuine birth».

Such is Simonides' epitaph in that journal.

Further criticism of Simonides' explanation is made by the original investigator, Silvester Davies, in a letter to *The Guardian* 24th June 1863 (and repeated by *The Literary Churchman* 1st. July 1863):

Sir —Though I shall have to trouble you again about Kallinikos and his evidence, I think it right at once to reply to M. Simonides.

In the first place, he draws attention to the fact that the letter which I forwarded to you is signed Kallinikos Hieromonk of Sinai, while the letters from his friend at Alexandria were signed simply Kallinikos Hieromonk; and he asks, «What has my friend in common with Kallinikos of Sinai?» And in the next place he tries to throw doubt on the genuineness of the letter. On this latter point I shall have more to say hereafter.

And I will only now observe in reference to M. Simonides' second objection, that, whether it be lawful in the Greek Church, or not, to give titles of veneration to the clergy of other Churches, it is not uncommon to find individuals who will willingly do so. And I can assure M. Simonides that it has occurred to an English clergyman to be invited by Greek priests to come within the chancel whenever he should attend their services. This courteous permission was not taken advantage of; but, whatever we may think of its irregularity, it was an acknowledgment of English orders on the part of those who gave the invitation. And, knowing besides this, that the

English Church is by no means always regarded in an unfriendly light by the Greeks, I was not surprised at a «title of veneration» on the present occasion. To the first and third objections of M. Simonides I have nothing to reply at present. The letter is nicely written apparently by an amanuensis, the signature being added in larger characters by the Hieromonk; and from the final ς a kind of flourish is carried under the word Σιναιτης, which *may* be meant for a cross, but I cannot affirm that it is. With regard to the third objection, I can only suppose that the rule he mentions is relaxed in favour of the elder members of a monastery.

In his fourth objection Simonides asserts that the letter bears marks of translation from a foreign tongue into Greek. The matter is before the public. Let Greek scholars deal with this assertion if they think it worth while to do so. But since Simonides has selected the ending of the letter as the part which most clearly betrays a foreign idiom, I will simply refer to any collection of Greek letters, and it will be found that this style of ending is considered perfectly good Greek; and I am far from being convinced that an ecclesiastic, who has mingled with many men, must invariably use a style different from that of other Greeks.

The date of the letter was very fortunate for Simonides, and I cannot blame him for making the most of it; though he rather amusingly sacrifices to his ingenuity and mirth, that character of gravity and freedom from the ways of the world, in Greek ecclesiastics, which he has impressed upon us a little before. I shall not further dwell on the letter, as I shall have to resume the subject on another occasion.

But it is due, Sir, to all parties that I should now give my reasons for having written to Kallinikos of Sinai. I was anxious to discover the writer of the letters from Alexandria dated October, &c., 1862, and signed simply «Kallinikos Hieromonachos». Many believed that the writer of those letters was rather to be sought for in England than elsewhere, and many believe that he is to be found here still. I had these *data* to guide me in my search. He was a Hieromonk writing from Alexandria. He was an old man («an old man awaiting death daily», who hastens unasked to make a communication before his death. See his letter dated Alexandria, October 15, 1862). He was one greatly respected and well known. He was quite conversant with matters that took place at Sinai on certain important occasions. Inquiries were set on foot at Alexandria, and it was found that there was no Hieromonk of that name in the place, but that there was one at Sinai, an old man much respected and well known. Will any one after reading over the letters of the Hieromonk say that I had not some grounds for concluding that *this* Hieromonk was the one *intended* under the signature of the letters from Alexandria? I therefore addressed my letter to *him;* and I wrote to him, moreover, because I thought it probable that fresh evidence might be obtained from Sinai. And this has been the case. Kallinikos of

Sinai asserts, on the authority of his old and long - standing brethren, that no Simonides has visited the monastery, and that the Codex published by Tischendorf was marked in the ancient catalogue of the monastic library.

I can assure you, Sir, I am not surpised to find that Kallinikos of Sinai has no connection with the Kallinikos of Simonides. And I shall be surprised if I ever succeed in discovering the latter. Simonides, as usual, has been most circumstantial in his description. He has given us his friend's birth in 1802 («the old man», &c. who apologises for «the garrulity of an old man», at the age of fifty – six, see his letter, Aug. 1858); he has told us something of his pedigree and exploits; and he has mentioned one other point which may be of use. Kallinikos, however, has now become Kallinikos *of Athos.* He has originally (see his letters) *simply* the Hieromonk Kallinikos. In Simonides' letter to the *Guardian,* dated Dec. 3, 1862, his friend is described by him as the Hieromonk Kallinikos *of Alexandria.* But there he was not to be heard of. Again, after a short interval, the same personage is introduced to us as Kallinikos *of Athos.* Truly it is bewildering to follow Simonides and his friends. Seek for Kallinikos, and you have to travel hopelessly from place to place. Moreover, there are so many of the name that it is quite possible, Simonides says, that I may receive a letter from a Kallinikos of Athens who will know as little of him as the Hieromonk of Sinai. We must regret that his friend is not more traceable than in a place where thousands of monks are congregated. And still further, it is sometimes difficult to discover the presence of Simonides himself. At Sinai, indeed, the monks can give no account of him, because *they* are repeatedly being shifted about. But occasionally, to add to our perplexity, Simonides' name and dress are changed. Look for him at Athos, and we shall probably miss him, for he is habited as a monk, and he goes by the not uncommon name of Sophronius. How this fact, by the way, can contribute to his non - identification at *Sinai* I am a loss to discover.

And while we are engaged in the secondary work of looking after witnesses, «all this time», says Simonides, «the real test of the genuineness of the Codex Sinaiticus is neglected». But let me remind him that Kallinikos *of Athos,* as we must now style him, came forward with evidence which Simonides must consider to be important. Let him bring him into still clearer light.

I need trespass on your space no further at present. Those who desire other imformation than mine about the transmission of my letters to, and from, Sinai, may write the Rev. Edwin J. Davis, Consular Chaplain at Alexandria, and he will, I am sure, answer their inquiries.

J. Silvester Davies

As a result of these criticisms Simonides was obliged to alter his story. These modifications appear on 1st. July 1863 in both *The Guardian* and *The Literary Churchman.*

Sir —I see that a *clerical* error has been made by my translator in my letter to you of the 17th June, which has rather needlessly perplexed Mr. Davies, but which I hasten to correct. The context should have shown that gentleman that *Mount Sinai* and not *Mount Athos* was intended to have been mentioned as the place in which for political reasons I changed my dress. In *Mount Athos,* where I was well known, there was no necessity for such disguise.

It is impossible to understand the invitation by Greek priests to an English clergyman, to come into the chancel during the time of service; as such an offer would subject him to ecclesiastical penalties according to the canons of our Church, as Mr. Davies ought to know. I concur with Mr. Davies in asking Greek scholars to decide whether the letter purporting to come from Kallinikos of Sinai does not throughout betray a *foreign idiom.*

Mr. Davies wants to make out that I have changed the residence of Kallinikos. It is not so. In the same letter (of Dec. 3d.) in which he is called «Kallinikos *of* Alexandria»—(It should have been translated «has written *from Alexandria»,* ἐξ 'Αλεξανδρείας ἔγραψε)—I stated that he was living at *Mount Athos* when I wrote the Codex. I call him «*of Mount Athos*», because he is a *monk of Mount Athos,* and all Mr. Davies' ingenuity cannot destroy his existence or history, or identify him with the monk of Mount Sinai.

Mr. Davies shirks my query about Tischendorf: when is he coming?

C. Simonides

Again it is significant that Simonides tries—as in his letter to *The Literary Churchman* 16th, June 1863—to shift the focus to Tischendorf's allegedly suspicious behaviour.

Another attempt to buttress the original story is made in *The Literary Churchman* 2nd November 1863 when another letter by Kallinikos of Alexandria appears.

Greeting in the Lord

On my arrival in the island of Rhodes, from Beyrout, I found in circulation many absurd and ridiculous stories (for which I was not prepared) attacking the genuineness of my letter which I sent to you from Alexandria. I pity those who have published falsehoods so unfounded; for it appears to me, that these men attempt to mislead public opinion for the sake of individual interest; but I understand that «the golden fountains are babbling», as the proverb says[32].

And so I say to you boldly, for the sake of sacred truth, that I sent three letters from Alexandria, one to the Editor of the *Guardian,* a second to the *Times,* and a third to the *Literary Churchman.* I wrote them myself,

32. It is interesting but not surprising to note that Simonides himself was in the habit of larding his letters with proverbs!

my subordinate, *Eusebius*, copied them, and then I signed and forwarded them, and sent the original to Simonides; and they who say the contrary, utter a manifest falsehood, for Simonides had no previous knowledge about these letters, but when he found from me what I had done, reproved me for it properly, because he did not wish the matter to be borne testimony to by *me*, for political reasons.

And further, I repeat, that the MS. in dispute is the work of the unwearied Simonides, and of no other person. A portion of this was secretly removed from Mt. Sinai, by Professor Tischendorf, in 1844. The rest, with inconceivable recklessness, he mutilated and tampered with, according to his liking, in the year 1859. Some leaves he destroyed, especially such as contained the Acrostics of Simonides; but four of them escaped him, viz., one in the Old Testament, and three in Hermas, as I long since informed Simonides: many palaeographical symbols also escaped his notice, but I do not know whether these were eventually overlooked.

I have to add, that some of the more foolish among our monks at Cairo were bribed to copy and sign certain letters sent from Leipzig and England, containing many things adverse to Simonides. I do not know, for certain, what came of it; but I warn you not to fall into the modes of those who are systematically plotting against humanity for the sake of lifeless gold.

Farewell,

Pardon the old man,

Kallinikos Hieromonachos

Rhodes, Sept. 17, 1863.

A slightly different version of this letter appeared in *The Guardian* 11th November 1863:

+ To the Editor of the Guardian, greeting

Joy unto thee,

I am astonished that they are not ashamed who give out that Simonides wrote the letter which I addressed to thee last year from Alexandria, concerning the MS. taken away from Mount Sinai by Professor Tischendorf.

I, friend Editor, wrote that letter of my own accord and through the medium of my clerk, Eusebius, and I signed it with my own hand; and this I did for truth's sake, and that I might free humanity from Tischendorf's error. I also wrote two more letters on the same subject, and besides these I wrote also others to Simonides on the same subject.

And as regards the letters, I wrote them all. But Simonides wrote the Codex that was taken by Tischendorf from Mount Sinai, and which was corrupted by Tischendorf himself. Let therefore those give over that distort truth for the sake of worldly interest.

Know also that lately two pseudo—monks have been hired that they may write against Simonides and make their nonsense known through the

English press, as at other times also those miserable men did in Germany, France and Turkey.
Good health unto thee in the Lord, and excuse

+ *Callinikus the Monk*
who blesseth thee with all his heart.

Rhodes, Sept. 27, 1863.

In the light of the above Silvester Davies continued his investigations and made further enquiries about Kallinikos of Alexandria. *The Guardian* 2nd. December 1863 introduced the resulting correspondence and correctly assumed that these further revelations would close the Simonides controversy.

(We have now received the following letters from Mr. Davies, which replies to the first enquiry propounded by Mr. Hodgkin, with the insertion of which we must be allowed to close the controversy, unless some new and important fact should come to light).

Sir —I beg to forward to you the following letters. They go towards supplying the omissions in my last answer to Mr. Simonides, dated June 20, 1863.

Letter marked 1 is from Mr. Consul West of Suez. It explains the method of transmission of my letter on the pretensions of Simonides to the Hieromonk Kallinikos of Sinai. Number 2 is addressed to yourself from the Rev. Edwin J. Davis, Consular Chaplain at Alexandria. 3 and 4 are the letters referred to by Mr. Davis, and are addressed to him. Of these letters I have also enclosed translations. I abstain from making any comments; but I desire that these enclosures may be compared with the testimony obtained from Sinai, and with that lately received by Mr. W. A. Wright from Salonika.

Woolston, Southampton, Nov. 26

J. Silvester Davies

London, Sept. 3, 1863

(No. 1)

My dear Sir—...I received your notes on the subject of your communication with the monks of Mount Sinai. The letter forwarded to me by Mr. Davis of Alexandria was made over to a person by the name of Machael Codsi Manouli, a resident at Suez, personally well known to me, and agent for the convent establishment at Mount Catharine, He is, I know, in frequent communication with the monks, and as moreover he not only enjoys the Vice – Consular protection, but is under personal obligation to me, I am fully convinced of the punctual delivery of the said letter, the more so that it was specially recommended to him. He would have sent an express messenger with in had I so desired it, but I preferred letting it go with his regular correspondence as opportunity of so sending it occurred. The reply came fully as soon as I anticipated receiving it, although I could

not say what might have been the lapse of time between the despatch of the letter and the receipt of the reply, which was immediately forwarded of Alexandria.

Unless I had carried the letter myself, I could not be morally more certain than I am of its having been safely delivered and replied to by the person to whom it was addressed, as I am too well known at Suez to render any deceit in such a matter probable, and unless it could be clearly proved to me that Machael Codsi had a very cogent object in deceiving me, or that the letter itself had been withdrawn from the Bedoween bearer of it, nothing would shake my conviction that the reply is as genuine as possible.

Believe me, dear sir, yours faithfully,

Geo. West

Alexandria, Egypt, Oct. 26, 1863

(No. 2)

Sir—Hitherto I have been prevented from replying to the letter of Mr. Const. Simonides (published in the *Guardian* of June 17), but at length I am able to supply some indirect evidence in favour of the Codex Sinaiticus. The letter of the Rev. J. S. Davies to the Hieromonk Callinikos of Sinai was translated into Greek by a Greek gentleman of Cairo and sent by me through the British Consulate here to G. West, Esq., British Consul at Suez, with a request that he would kindly endeavour to forward it to its destination.

This gentleman I saw as he was passing through Alexandria on his way to England some months since, and he informed me that he had sent it to Mount Sinai by a safe channel. I did not inquire *how* he had forwarded it, but he said he had not intrusted it to a Bedouin; and he had left orders at Suez that reply should be sent to me through the British Consulate here. Accordingly I duly received the letter of Callinikos which appeared in your number of May 27.

Mr. Simonides affects doubt of the genuineness of that letter. I can only say that I sent it just as I received it; and as Mr. West is (I believe) still at Southampton, he can doubtless explain, if necessary, by what means it was brought from Mount Sinai to Suez.

I am morally certain that we have in it a perfectly genuine letter. As to the objections made to its date, style, &c., I need only cite in refutation of them the authority of the Bishop and clergy of the larger Greek church here, and of the clergy of the Church of St. Saba, to whom I showed the copy of the *Guardian* containing the letter. These gentlemen told me that its style is not at all unusual; that the signature of the Cross at the beginning and end of letters is usual only in the letters of high ecclesiastics of the Greek Church. The objection about the date (April 1st) they treated as puerile.

Possibly it may not «be lawful for any of the clergy of the Greek

Church to give titles of veneration to the ministers of any congregation not recognised by the Greek Church», but the Church of England *is* recognised by the Greek Church. Personally I was treated with the utmost courtesy, and that *as an English clergyman,* the Bishop always giving me the usual kiss of peace on coming and going.

I was told that it is true there are certain forms which a Greek ecclesiastic would not address to the clergy of other Churches, but those in the letter of Callinikos were such as might be used, e.g., to myself. As to the fact of a monk not being allowed to write a letter without the knowledge of his «Hegoumenos», they told me that in a strict monastery—such as Mount Sinai—this was true; that a letter must be shown to him before it is sent away, but that his approval of it is generally expressed, not by a written permission, or even by signature, but by his attaching the seal of the monastery. And this was the case with the letter of Callinikos, the seal of Mount Sinai (the Burning Bush) being upon it.

My inquiries concerning Callinikos *of Athos* had no result. We all know how difficult it is to prove a negative—viz., that such a person was NOT in Alexandria during the autumn of 1862. But none of the clergy of the places in this city where a monk while here would assuredly reside, knew anything whatever of a Callinikos *of Athos,* although several knew a Callinikos *of Sinai.* They seemed perfectly well acquainted with Mr. Simonides. At St. Saba they mentioned his having made a short stay in Alexandria some years sinve, and they showed me a copy of one of his works (in English)—an account of the Mayer Papyri. They believed two brothers of Mr. Simonides were residing in Egypt, though they could not tell me the spot. I am bound to say that they did not express a very favourable opinion of Mr. Simonides' veracity. One of them said if further information was required, the University of Athens should be applied to.

I had been informed that the Bishop (who resides at the larger Greek church here) had been educated and lived for some time at Mount Athos, and application having been made to him by me through our Consulate, he gave me the enclosed letter containing his recollections of Mr. Simonides.

I forward also testimonials from the «Hegoumenos» of St. Saba (the old Greek church here), which he gave to me by permission of the Patriarch of Alexandria, whose signature, &c., is attached.

I have no personal feeling whatever either for or against Mr. Simonides.

This is the simple result of inquiries undertaken at the cost of considerable trouble to myself, in the cause of truth; and I hope I have thrown some light, at least on the secondary evidence for the Codex Sinaiticus. The Codex will, of course, speak for itself—I beg to remain, Sir, yours most obediently,

Edwin John Davis
H.B.M. Consular Chaplain, Alexandria.

Most respected Mr. Edwin John Davis—

+I received with pleasure on the same day your letter to me of the 26 (8) instant, by which you inquire of my unworthiness respecting the conduct while on the holy Mount Athos of Mr. Constantine Simonides, requesting me at the same time to communicate to you truthfully all that I know respecting him, as having myself passed eighteen years on the said holy mountain. But although this is not a little difficult for me, both because I am much occupied here in the affairs of our holy Church, and also because much time has now elapsed, and I am therefore unable to state with accuracy the dates of the circumstances known to me respecting Mr. Constantine Simonides, nevertheless, I say, I proceed by this my present letter to acquaint you with all that I know and am still able to call to memory respecting him.

During my residence in Odessa in the house of the sister of the late General Alexander Sturtza, the Countess K. Etling, she returned from Constantinople about the year 1841 or 1842, whither she had gone some time before, bringing with her the person of whom we speak, Constantine Simonides, whom she had taken under her care from Constantinople at the request of the Reverend Archimandrite Procopius Duedrinos, and afterwards, with the consent of her said late brother, Alexander Sturtza, introduced him to the Greek school in that place, as having then a slight knowledge of the rudiments of our ancient Greek language, and there he took lessons for some few months. It was there that I first became acquainted with Mr. Simonides, who assured me many times that he had lived in the sacred Russian monastery on the holy Mount Athos, and that the Reverend Deacon Benedict of that place was his uncle; also that this Benedict had sent him to study, and that on the conclusion of his studies he should return immediately to the holy mountain in order to become a monk, and afterwards a preacher, with other like things. But having attended, as I said before, for some few months only the lessons at Odessa, he was expelled from the school in consequence of his disorderly conduct, and for the same reason the Countess Etling and her brother, A. Sturtza, withdrew from him their patronage, and subsequently Mr. Simonides departed to Moscow.

About the year 1843, I, having renounced the vanity of this present would, proceeded to the holy Mount Athos, and there entered the sacred Russian convent; and making particular inquiries there respecting Mr. Simonides, I was informed that he had indeed lived there, but had been dismissed in consequence of his disorderly and scandalous conduct, and that he had no relationship with the Reverend Benedict, excepting only that he was a fellow – countryman.

After the lapse of seven or eight years, Mr. Simonides gave out, both by word and by the press, that during the time he resided in the Russian convent he had discovered, with the said Reverend Benedict, within the an-

cient monastery of the Russians, caverns containing many ancient parchment manuscripts, of which he had himself taken a quantity, including some of remarkable antiquity. These things being reported on the holy mountain, those who knew Mr. Simonides gave no hearing nor attention to such absurdities, but one of the principal persons of the holy mountain, the Superior of the sacred and greatest Laura distinguished for learning and virtue, by name Hadgi Cionysius, induced by curiosity, wrote officially to our Hegoumenos of the sacred Russian convent, Gerasimus (who still worthily presides over it), asking him if there was any truth in Mr. Simonides' asserions respecting caverns and ancient books, &c. He, however, answered him officially by a monasterial note that these things were entirely without existence and without foundation.

After two or three years, however, Mr. Simonides came, a second time, dressed in the European fashion, and I, reminding him of the words which he had spoken to me at Odessa—namely, that after he had finished his studies he intended to become a monk on the holy mountain, and ultimately a preacher—found him far from intending to carry out his professions, and engrossed by quite contrary ideas. As, however, our Hegoumenos would not allow him access to the library of our monastery, he went away to other monasteries on the holy mountain, that he might examine their libraries, but as in some of the said monasteries he mutilated many manuscript books, wickedly tearing out of them entire sheets, the entrance to many libraries of the said monasteries was forbidden him, and thus he departed from the holy mountain with disgrace.

After some time, however (I know not how long), he went to Constantinople, and presenting himself before the sacred Synod there, he asserted that he knew a cavern in which were buried the autograph Canons of the Holy Apostles, and this he said he knew from other ancient manuscripts discovered by him on the holy Mount Athos, relating shamelessly both the how and the when he had discovered them. There happened to be present, however, in the sacred Synod, his Blessed James, now Patriarch of Alexandria, then Metropolitan of Serres, who proved that Simonides was shamelessly telling falsehoods, since he, the then Bishop, was well acquainted with the holy mountain having often been there on ecclesiastical business. In consequence of this, being expelled and driven out from the sacred Synod of Constantinople, he departed into Europe; and, as it is reported on the holy mountain, ahving traversed many parts of Europe, he passed over at last to England, where, as I think, he remains to this day.

Further, I am well aware that this Simonides did bring to light two books, which also I have read: the one is the history of his native place, the island of Syme; the other, the explanation of the art of painting, of Dionysius the monk: but when he published them I do not exactly remember, nor do I know whence he obtained them; and this is all I know or remember respecting Mr. Constantine Simonides.

Lastly, I have informed by the Venerable Priest Constantius, of this place, who is also a compatriot of Mr. Simonides, that when the latter came here five or six years ago, he neither visited the holy Mount Sinai, nor Upper Egypt.

These things I state for your information; and I avail myself of the present opportunity to express to you my high consideration. Your friend, with respect and esteem,

+*Amphilochius (Bishop) of Pelusium*

Alexandria, Egypt, the 5th Oct., 1863.

(Translation of No. 4)

JAMES, Patriarch of Alexandria.

I, the undersigned, declare that no monk of Mount Athos of the name of Kallinikos resided during the past summer in the Monastery of St. Saba, in this place. I know two monks of Sinai bearing that name, of whom one died some years ago, and the other is still living. Moreover when Mr. C. Simonides came to Alexandria in 1852, about the month of August, he resided on board the ship *George and Minna* of Maliaracades, Captain Nicolas, and sailed with that ship for England. He sometimes, however, slept at the wine—shop of the Cyprist, George Televantos; but I do not believe that he went to Mount Sinai; and he never resided in the Monastery of St. Saba.

Alexandria, July 26th, 1863.

Meletius of Syme,
Prior and Archimandrite

I certify the genuineness of the signature of the Archimandrite and Hegoumenos, Meletius.

It is at this point that the search for Kallinikos, the supporter of Simonides is abandoned. No more is heard of him. It is at this stage too that Simonides himself fades from the scene. Journals like *The Literary Churchman* and *The Guardian,* previously filled with his name and his correspondence, moved on to other pursuits.

Simonides' subsequent history is unknown[33]. After publishing his edition of *Periplus* in 1864 (see the appendix to Chapter IV) he faded from the literary scene. Possibly he returned to Greece. At any rate he and his story about Sinaiticus were discredited. Tischendorf's judgement about the age, composition and significance of Codex Sinaiticus were to remain without serious challenge.

Ironically, had it not been for Simonides' attempts to cast doubt on Tischendorf's scholarly judgement many scholars, especially in England, may not have

33. A MS. of Aeschylus P e r s a e, which appeared in Egypt in 1872 was exposed in R h e i n i s c h e s M u s e u m XXVII as a forgery by Simonides. N o t e s a n d Q u e r i e s 26th October 1867, series 3 XII p. 339 reported his death in Alexandria in that month. (Mrs S. Owen of Oxford kindly furnished me with these references).

been so interested in verifying the details about Sinaiticus or taken so much notice of the manuscript.

In two concluding chapters, we will look back on Simonides' career prior to the Sinaiticus affair. It will be seen that well before 1862, Simonides was known as a dubious character in scholarly and literary circles. What is particularly interesting is that despite this so many people were prepared to debate seriously Simonides' challenge to Tischendorf rather than merely ignore it or dismiss it out of hand.

IV. SIMONIDES THE FORGER

What is surprising about the Simonides affair is not so much that it happened at all or that it lasted for over a year, but that a man with Simonides' known background had any credibility at all.

The Journal of Sacred Literature introducing the Sinaiticus affair describes Simonides as «a man of real ability but of dubious reputation in the learned world».

This reputation was in large measure due to his being known as a forger, as Tregelles reminds us in his letter to *The Guardian,* 11th February 1863:

> It must not be forgotten that, in dealing with Simonides, we have to do with one about whom there are serious questions:
>
> (1) As to the forged Uranius and Hermas, &c.
>
> (2) The pretended papyri of St. Matthew, &c. of the first century (published).
>
> (3) The pretended copy of St. John's First Epistle, of the first century, containing 1 John v. 7 (unpublished).
>
> (4) And now the claim that he in 1840 wrote a MS. in perfect imitation of a document of the fourth century, professing in part to be copied from an ancient Codex, corrected by the hand of the martyr Pamphilus; and containing corrections apparently of various ages, and by very various hands.

Simonides replies to this in his characteristic way (in *The Literary Churchman,* 16th, March, 1863).

> I am urging that Mr. Tregelles has been led into error; but it is not wonderful, for we are but men, and by nature liable to error. What he says about *Uranius* and *Hermas,* is of no consequence; for he does not know anything about them, and their genuineness will not be shaken by his statements.

This is hardly a reply. Let us therefore look into Tregelles' charges.

I. JOHN

The third charge in Tregelles' list concerns I John. Wright challenged Simonides to produce this manuscript (*Guardian* 28th January 1863).

> Allow me to ask him one question through the medium of your columns. In the *Literary Gazette* of August 31st, 1861, he (=Simonides) announced the discovery of a papyrus of the first century more than three feet long containing part of the 1st Epistle of St. John, and the whole of the 2d and 3d Epistles. The disputed verse, 1 John v. 7, he gave in full... Where is this papyrus, and why does he not exhibit it?

This evoked a reply from Simonides in the following week's issue:

> PS.—I reply in a postscript to the question which Mr. W. A. Wright, in his usual headlong manner, has put to me, upon a matter in no degree con-

cerning the Codex Sinaiticus, but which he thinks might prove another stone to throw at Simonides, at a time when legitimate ammunition is beginning to fail him. The MS. on papyrus, containing part of the Gospel of St. John, as well as that containing part of the 1st Epistle and the 2d and 3d Epistles, which he so conveniently assumes that I have not exhibited is now in London. It was displayed at Christ's College, Cambridge, for a week, during the meeting of the British Association, where it was seen by hundreds of gentlemen, among others by Mr. Babington and Mr. Bradshaw. It has been since exhibited in London, at the rooms of the Royal Society of Literature, on Jan. 7th, 9th, and 10th, together with the other MSS. discovered in the museum of M. Mayer.

2. URANIUS

The second dubious manuscript we will deal with is the History of the Kings of Egypt up to the Reign of Ptolemy Lagus by Uranius of Alexandria. This manuscript (number 1 in Tregelles' list) was offered by Simonides to Lepsius around 1855. The controversy surrounding this manuscript occurred mainly in Germany, because Lepsius and Dindorf of Leipzig originally accepted the manuscript as genuine but it was later rejected as spurious. The history of the furore from Simonides' side is given in the *Biographical Memoir* by Stewart p. 44 in the following way:

> It is now necessary to speak of the manuscript of Uranius, which has been the subject of so much controversy among learned men. This manuscript was pronounced to be genuine by four of the most learned professors of Leipsic; but was afterwards attacked in the most violent manner by the enemies of Simonides. The controversy raged with great virulence for some time, and the course pursued by Simonides, unacquainted as he is with the habits and tone of thought of the present century, was perhaps not the best calculated to remove any doubts that arose during the contention. The efforts of Simonides to vindicate its genuiness were, however, partially successful, and still greater success attended the exhibition of the manuscript, an examination of which convinced all unprejudiced persons of its high antiquity and great value. The result was, that the Royal Library at Vienna offered a very large sum for its purchase. This offer was refused, as were likewise several proposals made by Sir Thomas Phillipps, who twice called on Simonides to treat for its purchase.
>
> Simonides has always refused to part with this MS., and he values it so highly that it is doubtful whether any sum, so matter now large, would tempt him to dispose of it to any other than a fellow countrymen and then only upon condition that it was placed in one or other of the Greek libraries[34].

The story of the Uranius MS. was given in *The Athenaeum,* 23rd February, 1856:

34. On the resulting prosecution in Germany, see p. 185 f.

The learned men of Berlin have been overreached. Excess of ingenuity has made them credulous; and some of the first persons in German literature have been made the dupes of an imposture as marvellous as any which the history of literary forgery has to show...

Simonides came, opened his scroll, and cheated the Pundits. He professed to be able to solve all mysteries, and remove all historical doubts. The long controversy on Egyptian chronology was at last to end. He produced a work, lately discovered in the East, containing the whole history of Egypt, written by a man who had access, not only to the whole work of Manetho, but to the sacred records in the temples of Memphis and Heliopolis. The first classical scholars of Germany adopted the story; and Prof. Dindorf has published part of the scroll of «pure Simonides», under the title of «Uranii Alexandrini de Regibus Aegyptiorum Libri Tres; Operis ex Codice Palimpsesto edendi Specimina proposuit Gulielmus Dindorfus, 1856». The palimpsest consists of seventy—one leaves, each page containing two columns; so that the whole work would comprise 284 columns. It is written, we learn from Prof. Dindorf, in uncial letters. After the original writing had been effaced, the parchment appeared to have been used again, by a writer of about the twelfth century, for copying four works of greater interest than the History of Uranius. Specimens of these works are given by Prof. Dindorf in the Preface. The first is Διήγησις Ἰωσήφου εἰς τὸ μαρτύριον των ἁγίων Μακκαβαίους λόγος. The second gives a history of the Virgin Mary, and the discovery of her sacred gown. The third is a work of the Emperor Constantine, collected from various histories, giving an account of the picture of our Lord, which was sent from Edessa to Constantinople. This was published before, by Franciscus Combefisius, in «Originum Rerumque Constantinopolitanatum Manipulo» (Paris, 1664). The fourth gives a history of St. John the Baptist, and the discovery of his head.

These four works, as Prof. Dindorf says, are easy to read on the scroll of Simonides, while the effaced text of Uranius offers great difficulty, and requires the application of the strongest chemical means to make it legible.

The most important point was, of course, who is Uranius? On this Prof. Dindorf gives us the fullest information. Stephanus Byzantinus quotes Uranius, and calls him ἀξιόπιστος ἀνὴρ and the author of a work on the history of Arabia. But the forger was not content with so vague a reference. Another discovery was made: a manuscript giving an account of homonymous writers and poets, and, among the rest, a complete life of Uranius, the author of the History of Arabia and of the History of Egypt. Prof. Dindorf gives several extracts from this second scroll. First of all there was a life of Nonnus, the poet of the Dionysiacs. His age had been unknown hitherto; but he is here called a contemporary of Constantine the Great; and his death is placed in the fourteenth year of Theodosius, 392 A.D. Several works of Nonnus are mentioned, equally unknown, from previous authorities.

...The following titles of his works are mentioned: There books on the Kings of Egypt; three books on the Priests of Egypt; two books of the Egyptian priests on Laws; six books on the Habitations of the Egyptians; two books on Ethiopian Archaeology; five books on the History of Arabia; two books on the Kings of Ethiopia; three books on the History of the Rulers of Libya; four books on the Archaelogy of Lycia; two books on the Kings of Caria; four books called Periodus Egypti. Other writers of the name of Uranius are afterwards mentioned; but their works are of less interest. The ingenuity which could forge such a series is marvellous.

The pretended work of Uranius is the History of the Kings of Egypt, in three books, and is dedicated to Deimachus. This latter, as we learn for the first time, was a writer of great celebrity. His father was Xenocles, who wrote ten books on Roman history; and Deimachus himself, besides being a great patron of literature, is mentioned as the author of a work on Egypt.

After all this preliminary information, the wise men of Berlin approached the text of Uranius with high expectations, and almost a feeling of awe. Here, then, all the doubts which had occupied the thoughts of Champollion, of Rosellini, of Lepsius, and of Bunsen, were to be solved; the authenticity of the hieroglyphical records was to be tested, and the knowledge of the most ancient history of Egypt to be recovered! Manetho had risen from the grave; or, if not Manetho himself, at least one who knew his work, and who is able to give a much more complete account of the kings of Egypt than any of the chronographers on whom we had hitherto to rely.

...We need not show any further the great importance of this new scroll—had it only been genuine. But we are sorry to add, for Uranius, for Prof. Dindorf, and for all Egyptologists, that the manuscript if a forgery,—one of the most successful ever known among the *Amoenitates Literariae.* The name of Simonides is known to many collectors of manuscripts in England. He was in England last year, and, though notices had been published in foreign papers to warn the public against his forgeries, it is said that he was successful in disposing of several Greek manuscripts in this country, which he pretended to have discovered in a monastery of Mount Athos. If some of these manuscripts should turn out to be forgeries, those who bought them may now console themselves! Simonides went back to Germany. He presented the palimpsest of Uranius to the Academy of Berlin. The Members of the Academy appointed a commission to report on the genuineness of this manuscript; and with the assistance of some of the first chemists of the day, the Academy, comprising men like Bekker, Boekh, Lepsius, Meineke, Haupt, and Pertz, declared that the manuscript was genuine, and petitioned the King of Prussia to buy it at a very high price. Prof. Lepsius advanced 2,000 thalers to Simonides, in order to secure the manuscript for the Academy, and Prof. Dindorf, who has perhaps seen more Greek manuscripts than any scholar living, was so

eager to bring this wonderful discovery before the world, that he had a specimen of it printed without delay. His pamphlet will become a scarce book, for it was hardly published when Prof. Lepsius arrived at Leipzig with a policeman to arrest Simonides on the 1st of February. Prof. Lepsius, delighted at first by the complete confirmation which Uranius gave to his system of Egyptian chronology, found at last that the coincidences between Uranius and the writings of Bunsen and himself were of too startling a nature. The Berlin Academy had to reconsider its verdict. Simonides awaits his trial; Prof. Dindorf recalls his pamphlet; and the Berlin Academy will go into mourning during Lent.

Because of the Sinaiticus controversy in England in 1862—3 interest in the Uranius affair in Germany 7 years previous revived. In a letter to V.S.W. Vaux, M. Ehrenberg (from the Berlin Academy of Sciences) are the official view of the Uranius controversy.

Sir, In reply to your letter of the 29th of January, 1863, the Royal Academy of Sciences has the honour to bring the following circumstances, relating to the events that have happened here in connection with the forged Uranius of Simonides, to the knowledge of the Royal Society of Literature.

On the 9th of January, 1856, Professor W. Dindorf, of Leipzig, of great repute as a palaeographer *(Handschriftenkenner),* put before the Royal Academy a MS. of the twelfth century, left in his hands for sale by Simonides, which, as he asserted, after the most careful investigation, he thought to be a palimpsest, and to contain, in the original hand, three books of the Egyptian history of Uranius. A few unimportant passages of the supposed original text, written in uncial letters of the first centuries, had been rendered visible by the application of reagents, and appeared, both by their unsuspicious *(unverfanglich)* contents, and their skilful palaeographic execution, to justify the assertion of the above-named scholar. However, neither time nor opportunity was afforded for a more accurate investigation, till M. Dindorf, for a considerable pecuniary deposit, and the prospect of its being bought, agreed to place it in the hands of M. Lepsius.

As soon as M. Lepsius had brought to view a larger portion of the uncial text, he was convinced, both on philological and historical grounds, that it was a modern forgery. But as his mere assertion on these grounds, would not have sufficed for the conviction of the forger, he endeavoured to deduce also *material* proofs of forgery from the MS. itself. Five points of this nature were established and submitted for examination at a conference of academicians, particularly MM. Ehrenberg and Magnus, and were by them confirmed. Considering the importance of these *material* arguments to every later renewal of the investigation, we subjoin the two most decisive ones. The pale yellowish solution of iron, with which the uncial test was written, appeared in various instances to have spread *(ins Breite geflossen)*

into the strokes ruled for the text of the twelfth-century MS., and which divided the lines of writing and bordered the margin; and it (the uncial writing) must therefore be of a later period than the strokes (or ruled lines) which caused the spreading.

It was further seen that the uncial writing which, under the influence of the reagents, became quickly of a deep black, stood out distinctly, as from a clearer background, wherever it crossed the writing of the twelfth century, which only became darker after a time; consequently the uncial must have been written above and not below it.

These and other facts being established, Simonides, in the presence of M. Lepsius, was taken into custody at Leipzig; and on that occasion, the complete apparatus, both literary and chemical, which had clearly served for the forgery of these and other MSS., was confiscated. A lengthened detention of Simonides at Berlin (before his trial) afforded the opportunity of becoming thoroughly acquainted with the peculiar and rare ability and literary activity evinced by this man, in what he seems to have made the business of his life.

With regard to the special question contained in your letter respecting the text of Uranius, I have to reply that M. Dindorf possessed for many months a complete or almost complete copy, that is to say, the real original, of the three books of the Uranius, furnished him by Simonides; without either the Academy or more particularly M. Lepsius having been informed of it; and that M. Dindorf had already, towards the end of 1855, sent to press a specimen of it, together with an introduction, under the title, «Uranii Alexanrini De Regibus Egyptiorum libri tres. Operis ex codice palimpsesto edendi specimina proposuit Gulielmus Dindorfius. Oxonii: e Typographeo Academico, 1856», of which a few copies have reached Berlin[35].

Ehrenberg,
Chief Secretary of the Royal Academy of Sciences.

This report appears in the *Report* in the Mayer manuscripts (Trübner, London 1863) together with the official repart on the Uranius manuscript presented to the Royal Academy of Berlin on January 30th 1856.

Another letter published in the Mayer Report on the Uranius affair was from Dr. G.H Pertz of the Royal Library in Berlin to Sir Frederic Madden, Keeper of the Manuscripts, British Museum. January 15th, 1863.

My dear Sir,

I have received your letter, dated the 10th inst., about M. Simonides, and will try to answer your questions about him and his MS. as well as I can.

35. Two copies are in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. An account of how Oxford University Press ceased printing after the complimentary copies had been distributed is described in a MS. by W. Tuckwell (1859) in New College Library, Oxford.

1. Not Simonides, but Professor William Dindorf, of Leipzig, brought the said MS. entire, consisting of seventy – one leaves, to Berlin, and offered it for purchase to the Academy.

2. Those members of the Academy who took a particular interest in Egyptian, were hurried into the bargain, and Professor Lepsius in particular, who took the warmest interest, advanced 2000 thalers in order to secure the MS. at once. We others got no sight of the manuscript except during the hour from to five o' clock in the dark afternoon of January 9th, 1856, when we were allowed to look at it by candle-light. There it struck me that the employment of hydrosulphuric acid produced not the usual greenish, but *over the whole parchment a blackish* tint; but since a colleague of mine, who had tried to scrape at a small part of the double ink, assured me that in fact the ink of the uncial writing (viz. of Uranios) was the *lower,* I did not then trouble myself about the manuscript, but only reminded my colleagues, however ineffectually, about the known character of Simonides.

But when M. Lepsius allowed me, towards the end of the month, to examine at home a part of the MS. in his possession, I convinced myself easily that the system of lining, visible on each leaf of the MS., had been intended not for the Uranios, but for the twelfth – century text, and that the text of Uranios, attached to the same system of lines, had afterwards been inserted. This, my conviction, I expressed in a memoir which I read in the Academy on the 31st of January, but which has not been printed.

3. In the meanwhile M. Lepsius, who had, by transcribing the text, found that a forgery was at hand, and who was of course afraid of losing the 2000 thalers advanced, had gone to Leipzig, assisted by a Berlin police – officer, warned M. Dindorf, had Simonides arrested, and got his money back.

4. M. Lepsius then returned with Simonides to Berlin, and after having got my memoir and the opinions of my colleagues, read in the Royal Academy an *expose,* in which he collected the result of our united opinions about the imposture: subsequently, MM. Ehrenberg, Dove, and Magnus, after microscopical examination, arrived at the same conviction; and so the subject was dropped, as far as the Academy was concerned. M. Ehrenberg and his scientific colleagues had also found that the Uranios-writing passed over the minuscule text, which proved infallibly the imposture; but neither their opinions nor mine have every been printed.

5. A Greek, named Lycurgus[36] published in the Leipsic and Berlin papers, articles against Simonides, and there arose some quarrel besides, in consequence of Simonides being carried to Berlin. Our judges released him after some days, as not belonging to their jurisdiction, and he left Berlin,

36. Alexander Lycurgos was later Archbishop of Syros and Tinos.

returned to Leipzig, and, without further molestation, since nobody had any longer an interest in prosecuting him, set out for England.

6. No part of the Uranios was printed at Berlin, but the beginning of it at the Bodleian press at Oxford, a few copies of which have been obtained by M. Lepsius, and are still in his possession.

7. As to the present business, you will, I am sure, convince yourself easily of the real state of things by examining as I did, the system of lines in regard to the two texts, the effect of hydrosulphuric acid on the colour of the parchment and of the Uranios text, and the laying of the Uranios text over the theological text.

Wishing you the best success, I remain, my dear Sir,
Yours very truly,
Pertz

In England, the Royal Society of Literature discussed the Uranius manuscript at a meeting on February 11th 1863, which *The Literary Churchman* reported in its issue dated February 16th. See also *Literary Churchman* March 2nd and 16th. The Uranius Manuscript had however been known in England before this.

In a report on the meeting of the archaeological section of the Historical Society of Lancashire and Cheshire on November 1st, 1860 Simonides in the *Facsimiles*[37] abstracts from the local press the following:

> Dr. Simonides, who speaks English very imperfectly, then exhibited several manuscripts, written in Greek, and the Chairman entered into an elaborate explanation of them, stating that they were now just on the eve of making great discoveries in ancient writings. Dr. Simonides, who had been educated abroad, had discovered many rare manuscripts in the archives of the monasteries, and they were therefore now in the possesion of a much purer text than they were formerly. The Secretary then read for Dr. Simonides a translation of some arguments in support of his theory, showing that he differed from the French *savants*. Dr. Simonides also exhibited a decree in Egyptian hieroglyphics and the Greek translation, written on human skin, and enclosed in a small gold frame. He also showed by experiments how the writing on manuscripts, which had been rendered invisible by being traced over again by other characters, could again be brought clear. His elucidations were warmly received. Matters of interest having been fully discussed, the chairman thanked those gentlemen who had kindly exhibited them, and the meeting then broke up after a vote of thanks to the chairman.*
>
> **Vide Liverpool Mercury,* Nov. 2, 1860; *Liverpool Daily Post,* Nov. 3, 1860; and *Liverpool Weekly Mercury,* Nov. 3, 1860.

to which he adds:

37. Facsimiles of Certain Portions of the Gospel of St Matthew and of the Epistles of SS. James and Jude Written on Papyri in the First Century (London, 1861).

The curious MS., anonymously referred to in these articles, is the Palimpsest of Uranius of Alexandria, son of Anaximenes, which contains the history of the Kings of Egypt, the author beginning with the foundation of the kingdom, and ending with the reign of Ptolemy Lagus. And this it is which tried the learned men of Germany like gold in a furnace, and proved them utterly ignorant of antiquity, and ready to attack real knowledge as though it were a fraud, as many sensible Germans have said before me. For when I had spoken boldly and frankly before the authorities on the incessant demand of the persecutors of truth, and had defended myself against all their charges, the artful contrivance and plot of certain treacherous Germans was made manifest before the tribunal. Accordingly I was acquitted, being proved entirely innocent, and at the same time indemnified by the late munificent King of Prussia for the envious and unjust persecution I had undergone. Moreover, I was recommended by the judges to prosecute the lying calumniators and plunderers of my property, which, as I still possess the right of action, I shall do in due time; for it is not well to overlook the misdeeds of liars and slanderers. «He teacheth the unruly», says St. Paul, «that they be not lifted up». Likewise those in England who, during my absence, published a variety of charges against me in the English press, are advised to be prepared to prove their accusations against a man who is ever striving for the cause of knowledge; since otherwise they shall, as do the hogs, «return in kind more than they took», as the proverb has it. Among other journals the *Presse,* of Vienna, wrote as follows concerning me and the false accusation respecting Uranius.

SIMONIDES NO FORGER.—The Greek, Simonides, the champion of Philology, writes the *Berlin Morning Post,* though cleared from all charges affecting his honour, has left us the most painful Palimpsestic doubts. In literary circles, those who have been able to judge, and who have taken any interest in doing him justice, maintain that his Uranius MS. is genuine, and many great philological authorities hold the same opinion. They declare that had Simonides been capable of writing such a manuscript as «Uranius» he would have deserved double the sum that he asked for it from Professor Lepsius. Laying this argument aside, we feel that it must be an encouragement to us, mere tyros in learning, to see the first professors of science brought to the confession of the ancient philosopher Socrates, so simply yet so beautifully expressed in the words, «I only know, that I know nothing». The learned and honourable Simonides may, however, comfort himself with the consciousness that his laborious task has not been fruitless, and that future generations will make him amends for what he has now suffered in the cause of philology, and will wipe away the painful suspicions which have attached to him. He must hide his Palimpsest in the corner of some old library, and leave it to the lapse of time to bring his hitherto unrewarded labours to honour. In the year 1956, when weeds shall have

grown over the Berlin academies, and Dindorf's bones are mouldering in the grave, perhaps the government authorities will assist some scholar in his search after the Simonides' Uranius, and if haply he should discover it in the dust of that old library, he will at once make for himself a name and a reputation. It needs not the eye of inspiration to see how this fortunate scholar will immediately write volumes upon his valuable discovery; how the now despised parchment will be carried in triumph to the Session Hall, and how an oration will be delivered to the memory of Simonides, the unfortunate but original possessor of that «Uranius», so long despised and neglected by his prejudiced and short-sighted contemporaries.

«Die Zeit ernährt und reift die Saat
Es lohnt sich selber jede Thuut».

Die Presse, No. 88, Wien, 10th April, 1856.

Thus wrote the Vienna journal concerning the truth, receiving its contributions from a paper in Berlin, as did several others which I omit for the sake of brevity[38].

3. HERMAS

The other forgery mentioned by Tregelles in connexion with the Uranius is Simonides' manuscript of Hermas. The *Memoir* refers to this p. 43 f and turns this into an attack on Tischendorf:

> Of the manuscript of «Hermas» which was at first proclaimed to be genuine, but was afterwards stated by some persons to be a forgery, it is sufficient to say that the Academical Library at Leipsic subsequently examined it in the most careful manner, and were so certain of its authenticity, that they purchased it, and it now forms a highly – valued portion of their collection.
>
> The genuineness of the Palimpsest of Hermas has likewise been contested by no less a person than M. Tissendorf, who, as already observed, has a strong personal feeling against Simonides; but the value of the manuscript is best ascertained by the fact that the Imperial Library at Vienna considered themselves highly fortunate in being able to purchase a portion of it, notwithstanding the remarks made by those who opposed its authenticity. This is the best answer that can be given to M. Tissendorf.

Further reasons for Simonides' anti – German feelings and his personal animosity against Tischendorf are revealed here[39].

4. THE MAYER MANUSCRIPTS

Whereas in Germany it was the Uranius affair that attracted attention, in

38. A description of the Uranius affair and a selection of the correspondence on it by Dindorf, Tischendorf and Lycurgos is to be found in Simonides und Sein Prozess (Berlin, 1856).
39. See further p. 180.

England it was Simonides' alleged discovery of important biblical Manuscripts[40] in Mayer's museum in Liverpool that was widely reported in the English press. These MSS. were reported on by Simonides shortly before the Sinaiticus affair in «Facsimiles of Certain Portions of the Gospel of S. Matthew and the Epistle of SS. James and Jude written on papyrus in the first century and preserved in the Egyptian Museum of J. Mayer» (Trübner, 1862)[41].

In the Introduction to the *Facsimiles* Simonides gives us the following details:

> On the 13th of February, 1860, I called on that distinguished scholar, Joseph Mayer, in company with the Philhellenist, James Smith, for the purpose of inspecting his Collection. Through the introduction of my friend Smith I soon became familiar with this gentleman, and after a long conversation on antiquities, and particularly the Egyptian Museum, which he had founded in Liverpool at his own expense, he presented me with a free ticket of admission.
>
> Having accepted the ticket and thanked my entertainer, I took my leave and set out with Mr. Smith to the Museum. Here I closely examined the relics of antiquity treasured within it, especially the Egyptian, and noted such as were more peculiarly important. Afterwards I visited the Collection several times for the sake of the intellectual gratification it afforded, and having still more accurately inspected the more important relics I have previously noted, and convinced myself of their value, I reported the result of my researches to Mr. Mayer, on whom I again called in company with Mr. Smith. The former was highly delighted at the recital; and accordingly we all three proceeded at once to the Museum, where I pointed out the most historical of its contents, and concisely explained to them the contents of each hieroglyphic monument.
>
> They were much pleased with the interpretation, and after a variety of difficulties had been alleged, which I obviated to the best of my ability, Mr. Mayer gave me copies of the greater portion of the Egyptian remains contained in his Museum, in order to interpret them, and at the same time several rolls of papyrus discovered in the Egyptian coffins, to serve as confirmatory proofs. These I took, and after promising that I would strictly fulfil Mr. Mayer's request, we all separated.
>
> Accordingly, I thenceforth assumed the direction of the investigation, the correct transcription, and the interpretation, visiting the Museum daily for that purpose, and interpreted several tablets of hieroglyphics containing valuable matter, as well as seals and rings (ἀνδρόσημα), bearing moral maxims, some of which have recently been published.
>
> Meantime, after an illness from which I soon recovered, I began to search through the papyri in the Museum itself. These were, for the most

40. These are the «pretended papyri of St Matthew &c» ιν Τρεγελλεσ' list (p. 122).

41. Many of these papyri are in Liverpool Museum, and I am grateful to Dr Dorothy Downs, keeper of Antiquities, for allowing me access to the Simonides' papyri in the Mayer Collection.

part, so torn and damaged, lying pell – mell together, and offering neither connexion nor continuity, (for the number of the fragments, the variety of the writing, the dissimilarity of the papyri, and especially the triglot character of the manuscripts, threw everything into confusion), that at first I despaired at the formidable difficulties of my undertaking. But, after resting awhile, and reflecting that great success is not to be achieved without labour, I resumed my task, and applied myself to it vigorously.

First of all I separated the hieroglyphics from the Demotic writings, then the Coptic from the Greek; and again dividing them according to the periods of the writing, I commenced to adjust and adapt them.

After separating the papyri into their different languages and their various subjects, and finally adjusting the comminuted fragments, I dipped a sheet of calico in water, stretched in on a board, and nailed it to the edges. Next, I softened the fragments in tepid water, and fastened them with paste on the frame prepared as above; others I pasted upon paper, and having completed these preliminaries, I commenced the deciphering and careful transcription, beginning my labours with the Greek portion. Herein, to my surprise, I discovered first three fragments, and subsequently two others, containing a portion of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, written about the fifteenth year after the Ascension of our Saviour, by the hand of Nicolaus the Deacon, that is to say, in the forty – eight year after the Incarnation of the Divinity. For, at the end of the fifth fragment, which contains the latter part of the 28th chapter, the following words occur:

ΗΓΡΑΦΗ ΤΗΙ ΧΕΙΡΙ ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ ΚΑΘ ΥΠΑΓΟΡΕΥCΙΝ ΜΑΤΘΑΙΟΥ
ΑΠΟCΤΟΛΟΥ ΙΗCΟΥ ΧΡΙCΤΟΥ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΔΕ ΤΩΙ ΠΕΝΤΕΚΑΙΔΕΚΑΤΩΙ
ΤΗC ΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΑΝΑΛΗΨΕΩC ΕΤΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΙC ΕΝ ΠΑΛΑΙCΤΙΝΗΙ
ΠΙCΤΟΙC ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΙC ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΕΛΛΗCΙ ΔΙΕΔΟΘΗ

«The writing by the hand of Nicolaus the Deacon, at the dictation of Matthew, the Apostle of Jesus Christ. It was done in the fifteenth year after the Ascension of our Lord, and was distributed to the believing Jews and Greeks in Palestine».

This discovery was imparted first to Mr. Mayer, who communicated it at the Archaeological Meeting, which he assembled at his Museum on the first of May, 1860, immediately upon the conclusion of Mr. Thomas Wright's admirable discourse on the remains of the ancient Roman city just discovered in (Wroxeter) England, and the general remarks by the Rev. Dr. Hume on Mr. Wright's lecture, at which five hundred persons were present.

The *Liverpool Mercury* of May 2, 1860, makes the following observations: DISCOVERY OF AN ANCIENT BIBLICAL MANUSCRIPT, AT MR. MAYER'S MUSEUM OF NATIONAL AND FOREIGN ANTIQUITIES AND WORKS OF ART.

In this Museum are a great number of Egyptian, Coptic, and Greek manuscripts, written on papyrus, linen, leather, and stone, relating to various subjects, historical, religious, &c.; and Mr. Mayer has entrusted the unrolling of the papyri to the learned Dr. Simonides, so well known throughout Europe for his great proficiency in deciphering ancient writings; and he has already found parts of three leaves of a papyrus scroll containing the 19th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, written in the Greek uncial character, the reading of which will cause a great sensation amongst Bibliophilists, as it sets at rest that long misunderstood part of the 24th verse relating to the passing of a camel through the eye of a needle, which arose from the wrong reading of the Greek text. The state of the manuscript has every appearance, from the form of letter, and other rules used as guides to palaeographists, indicating it to belong to the first century after the death of Christ, and consequently older than any other Christian document known to exist.

As Mr. Mayer is going at once to publish the important discovery in fac-simile of the original text, with an English translation, we hope soon to have an opportunity of recurring to this subject.

The papyrus was brought from Thebes, in Egypt, by the Rev. Henry Stobart, along with many others, part of which he sold to the British Museum, some of which have since been published; but the lukewarmness displayed by the trustees of that great national institution, and the long delay of their decision in securing the remaining portion he had brought to England, induced Mr. Stobart to offer them to Mr. Mayer, who, seeing their value, at once purchased them to add to his already extensive library, and now Liverpool will have the pride and glory of possessing this invaluable Biblical document.

During Easter week the rooms of the Museum were opened to the public free, when 2,250 persons availed themselves of the privilege of examining their contents, and appeared to be much interested in what they saw, and conducted themselves with great propriety and order».

The *Liverpool Daily Post,* and the *Manchester Guardian* of May 3, 1860 and several other journals, political and literary, made similar remarks; and the *Literary Gazette,* August 24, 1860, writes:

«DISCOVERY OF OLD MSS. A discovery has recently been made which will doubless be of the greatest interest to the students of palaography. It appears that a Liverpool gentleman, of considerable repute as an archaeologist, possesses a Museum of Egyptian antiquities, containing, among other curiosities, some fragments of a papyrus manuscript, written, as he had been given to understand, in the Coptic character, and relating to matters of early Church history. It happened that Dr. Constantine Simonides, whose name will doubtless be recollected as occurring in connection with a disputed manuscript of Uranius, was at that time a resi-

dent in Liverpool, and to him the newly-discovered papyrus was accordingly submitted by the owner. Dr. Simonides at once declared the character to be Greek, and not Coptic; and, after further examination, pronounced it to be a portion of St. Matthew's Gospel, bearing the date of the first century, and hence, if not the original text, at least one of its earliest transcripts. Now, whatever opinion we may have formed of Dr. Simonides, from his last appearance before the literary public-and we should bear in mind that several facts which were then justly regarded as suspicious, have been recently established in his favour-his skill as a judge and decipherer of ancient manuscripts is beyond all question. We should also remember that the date of a papyrus document is most easily ascertainable, and consequently any attempt at fraud open to immediate detection; and, moreover, that forgery is impracticable, not only from the fact that the peculiarity of the material admits of no erasure or obliteration, but also because the species of papyrus anciently employed for manuscript purposes is now extinct. The public, however, will shortly have an opportunity of judging for themselves on the merits of the manuscript in question, as we hear that the proprietor, who has refused a large sum for it, has determined to publish it, and that, in all probability, it will appear in the course of a few weeks».

Two days subsequently to the first discovery, two more fragments were deciphered from the Epistle of St. James, and one from that of St. Jude, containing several essential passages not to be found in the existing version of the New Testament, and of which, in the interest of religion, a fac-simile is now for the first time published.

When this discovery was publicly made known, many of the learned in Liverpool, and from other parts of England, called upon me in order to see the passages, and after a minute inspection, heartily glorified God. My compatriots, the Greek residents in Liverpool and Manchester, (to whom I return my sincere thanks for their friendly sentiments and their many kindnesses), were highly rejoiced at the discovery of so great a treasure both to religion and archaeology; nor were those of London less pleased at the result.

Of the learned of the metropolis what shall I say? Many of them saw the fragments, and were delighted at the discovery that had been made. I may especially mention the amiable and truly evangelical family of N. Banyard, Esq., who invited to their house for the purpose of seeing and examining the fragments, several learned persons, all of whom were in ecstasies at the sight, and particularly the brother of Mrs. Banyard, a genuine servant of our Lord, (whose name unfortunately I do not remember), who took for his text at evening devotions the 28th of St. Matthew, and offered up prayer and thansgiving for the discovery of these sacred fragments of the oldest version of the New Testament.

About three days after this, the fragments of the Gospel, together with the works of Uranius, Aristaeus, and others, were similarly displayed at the

house of that accomplished Greek scholar, Nath. Bridges, Esq. and his distinguished father-in-law, General Alexander, of the Indian service, Mr. Edward Masson, a highly-intelligent Philhellenist, and in the houses of other persons of distinction.

Returning shortly afterwards to Liverpool, and resuming my archaelogical labours, I succeeded in discovering other MSS. not less valuable, and immediately communicated the fact to the Editors of the *Literary Gazette,* and the *Liverpool Daily Times,* to whom I wrote as follows:

«Sir,—You were good enough to give publicity in your impression of the 14th inst., to my discovery of New Testament fragments among Mr. Mayer's rolls of papyri. Perhaps you will oblige me by detailing the result of my subsequent searches in the same quarter,-the Egyptian Museum founded by Mr. Mayer.

The principal discoveries I have had the good fortune to make up to this present are:

1st. A portion of eight chapters of the Book of Genesis, written on papyrus in the Alexandrian style of Greek capital letters, which, from the purity of the text and the quality of the papyrus (being first class, and that called sacred) I conclude to belong to the first century before Christ.

2nd. The Ten Commandments written in Greek and Egyptian Demotic characters, in parallel columns, belonging also to the first century before Christ.

3rd. The voyages of Hanno, King of Carthage. This MS. is more correct than any yet known, and bears evidence of being written about the same period as the foregoing, viz. the century before Christ.

4th. The first page of a work by Aristaeus, written in the first century after Christ.

5th. A fragment containing a few lines of ethical writings from the Oracles of Zoroaster Magus, of the first century after Christ.

6th. Fragments of Historical writings, author unknown, but very interesting from the fact that they contain Historical and Geographical information never yet published. Written about the second century after Christ.

All these MSS. are upon Egyptian papyrus, and have had my most careful and attentive examination. Fac-similes, translation, and explanatory notes of the whole will, I hope, shortly by published. There are other rolls of papyri in the same collection which I have not yet had time to examine. When I have done so, I shall be glad to acquaint you with the result. Meanwhile, I beg to subscribe myself,

Sir, yours very truly,

C. Simonides, Ph.D.

Liverpool, 9th Aug., 1860

Two days after the discovery of the above MSS. I came upon seven Epistles of Hermippus, son of Eumenides of Berytus; of which the first four treat on the interpretation of certain symbolical sacred letters of the Egyptians; the sixth makes mention of sundry Kings of Egypt and Ethiopia; and the last deals with private affairs, concerning which I wrote as follows, on the 25th August, to the Editor of the *Literary Gazette,* and to the *Liverpool Daily Post.*

Sir,-Agreeably to my promise of the 9th inst. I would acquaint you from time to time with the result of my still continued labour of examining the papyri contained in the Egyptian Museum of this town, I hasten to inform you of the most unexpected and agreeable discovery of six letters, written by Hermippus, son of Eumenides of Brytus, but hitherto, together with his many other writings, alluded to by Suidas, supposed to be utterly lost.

The six letters in question are addressed to Horus, son of Hephaestion of Alexandria, in reply to sundry questions respecting ancient Egyptian hieroglyphics, and the Kings of Egypt and Ethiopia. They are of a contemporary date with Hermippus himself, who was born in the year 74, and died 162 years after Christ.

I beg to remain, Sir, yours very truly,
C. Simonides, Ph. D.

Liverpool, 25th August, 1860.

On the 6th September, were descovered some remnants of the Οἰκιστικὰ of Androsthenes, son of Diodorus of Thassos, and this discovery, considering it of importance, I communicated to the Editor of the *Liverpool Daily Post:*

«ANCIENT GREEK MSS.-Sir, The rolls of papyrus you saw in my possession, two days since, turn out, upon discovery, to be fragments of the «OIKISTIKA» of Androsthenes, son of Diodorus of Thassos. It is of the highest possible interest, as bringing to light places and peoples hitherto unknown, some in name even. The great source of regret in connexion with it is, that it is but fragmentary. Let us hope, however, that some equally fortuitous chance may some day enable us to light upon other portions in the yet undeveloped collection of papyri your good town has the honour to possess; thanks to our friend Mr. Mayer.

It may interest your readers to know that Marcianus, in his «Epitome of the Periplus of Menippus», speaks of Androsthenes, son of Diodorus, as a geographical writer of some note; but thus far this is all we have known about him. A more intimate acquaintance is not, however, possible, and all literary men must rejoice thereat, but none more so than,

Dear Sir, yours very truly,
C. Simonides, Ph. D.

Liverpool, 6th Sept. 1860.

On the 7th September, I found two other Epistles of Hermippus, concerning hieroglyphics and the Kings of Egypt. Of these, and the previously discovered Epistles of the same author, I shall treat at length and severally in the Preface. They will all be published speedily, not only in lithography, precisely as the original, but also with Heliotypic plates, to show the similarity of the writing, and in parallel columns of clear type, with notes for the more complete information of the reader.

In publishing, according to promise, the fragments of the New Testament, I may remark, first, that they were brought to England from Egyptian Thebes in 1856, by the Rev. Henry Stobart, whose name is universally known. These, together with others, the contents of which I arranged, came into the possession of the erudite Joseph Mayer, as both these gentlemen can testify, and as the public prints stated at the time. And besides these eight fragments, and that containing a portion of the 8th chapter of Genesis, one was discovered in the Collection of the Rev. Henry Stobart, together with an anonymous historical fragment.

Along with these, several other famous works of Grecian intellect were brought by the same gentleman from Egypt into England; among which is to be found the Funeral Panegyric by Hyperides, the winner of the oratorical prize, which he pronounced by command of the Athenian people over the tomb of Leosthenes, and those who heroically fell with him in the Samian war, and which was first edited by the Rev. Churchill Babington, Cambridge, 1858. The original, also on papyrus, is deposited in the British Museum, and was purchased for a large sum of money. Those who are curious in such matters may see all that relates to the Funeral Panegyric in the Editor's Preface and Introduction.

These, then, were discovered in the Collection of the accomplished Mr. Stobart, and all the rest in the Egyptian Collection of Mr. J. Sams, now in the may be found, for all the rolls discovered in the Egyptian coffins have not yet been unrolled. Both these gentlemen can witness that they were in the coffins, and that the rolls were not a little damaged in taking them out. Moreover, that they were not all obtained by them, but that some were previously purchased by other persons, and some they procured in Egypt. Thus, at least, unless my memory deceives me, the Rev. H. Stobart told me *viva voca,* at Adam Holden's the bookseller, on the 2nd May, 1860. ...

And here I must close my remarks on these matters, and render a public tribute of praise to Joseph Mayer, Esp., who has furnished so many objects of importance to the interest of science. Would that his laudable example were followed by others who have private libraries full of MSS., and especially by the keepers of public libraries, most of whom, unfortunately, condemn to perpetual imprisonment that which should be the common property of humanity, and will not place the intellectual and glorious works of

the ancients in skilful hands for investigation and publication. This ill-advisedly they do, looking to their own profit. But the day will come when the public, their only master, will call them to account for their ill-advisedness, and then we shall hear how they will endeavour to justify their wholly unjustifiable proceedings. For the public appointed them to be the hired custodians of its wealth, not to be its masters, or to appropriate to themselves, or, worst of all, to dispose of it by unfair obsequiousness. How many learned works of antiquity and the middle ages lie unknown in the British Museum and elsewhere in western Europe? And again, how many of these are vilified as counterfeits; and on the other hand, how many that are really counterfeit and falsely-titled, are considered to be genuine and correctly inscribed? In the same way, several very recent productions are stated to be ancient, and *vice versa.* And this assuredly results from the ignorance of the various librarians, or of those who have attempted to investigate such matters. Such unluckily are most of them in the present age, who have obtained their positions undeservedly, and of this the proof is their own works, which are full of inaccuracies resulting from imperfect knowledge. If Mr. Mayer had followed the example of those who fain would have a monopoly of learning, and who assail science as if it were a fraud, these earliest and sacred evidences of the Christian religion would have remained unknown for ages, and perhaps have been lost altogether, to the injury of mankind. For this reason I feel justified in praising and thanking him again and again, at the same time exhorting him, as a faithful servant of the Muses, not to become weary of their service; and in freely uttering these sentiments, I do but discharge my duty, having been a worshipper of science from my youth upward, and no imputation of flattery attaches to me. For so did my parents teach me to do from a child; and so did the chief of churches, the Greek, of which I am a genuine son, educate me.

For the same reason I should do ill to omit the name of G. Picton Silke, Esq. formerly of Queen's College, Oxon., who kindly undertook to render the present work from Greek into English, and in which it now appears for the first time, and who has successfully and felicitously acquitted himself of the task; and at the same time I return my thanks to my friends Charles and Henry Stewart, to whom I am indebted for my acquaintance with Mr. Silke, and for many friendly services. I also return a thousand thanks to Edward Masson, Esq., to whom Greece owes many obligations; and to William Bollaert, Esq., who investigated the American antiquities for this edition, both voluntarily aiding me in my work; as well as to that accomplished scholar, E. Hodgkin, Esq., who is indefatigable in such researches. I am deeply grateful also to my Greek compatriots residing in England, who have not ceased, and will not, in labouring for the progress of every good cause, like genuine descendants of those glorious men of olden Greece, the nurse of the Muses and the altar of light, who so often reared her trophies over barbarism, and was the benefactress of the whole world.

For to her, and her alone, is due the progress of enlightenment, free government, and the advancement of Christianity, which none can deny. Unhappily, in return for these benefits, the shortsighted statesmen of the present age have condemned the greater portion of the country, as it would seem, to eternal slavery, allying themselves with the believers in the Koran, the persecutors of Christianity and the Muses, the incendiaries of the inestimably valuable libraries of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Pergamus, Byzantium, Athens, Cnidus, Smyrna, Stageira, Patara, Cyprus, Rhodes, Syme, Chios, and others, public as well as private; the destroyers, too, of the numerous Grecian cities whence came so many great men, who yet reign and ever will reign in the schools of learning, teaching the human race through the works they have left us, teeming with knowledge of every description. To the descendants of these latter, I again say I return infinite thanks; and I place their names at the head of the list of subscribers, that those not knowing them may become acquainted with them.

In concluding this discourse, I would say to the President, Fellows, and honourable Members of the Historical Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, Gentlemen,

I feel no ordinary pleasure in being admitted into your honourable Society, which, in its solicitude for the history of nations and the progress of the arts, spares neither labour nor expense. This work therefore, containing, among other important investigations, an impression of the first evidences of Christianity and other valuable texts, the originals of which I exhibited to you in this city, where it is now first published, and where your Society assembled on the 1st Nov., 1860, I beg to dedicate to the Members at large, as a slight token of my regard. Trusting therefore that you will favourably regard this dedication, looking at the goodness of my purpose and nothing else, and that you will heartily pray that I may be enabled to bring out other more complete works for the public advantage, I say farewell, and subscribe myself, heart and soul,

Respectfully yours,
C. Simonides.

Concerning the public reception of his discoveries Simonides gives us this information in his *Facsimiles:*

On the 19th October, 1860, a Public Soiree was held in the Town Hall, Liverpool, for the purpose of thanking the benefactor of the town, William Brown, Esq., for the erection of a magnificent Public Library at his own cost. On this occasion I was requested to exhibit for the gratification of the meeting, some of the ancient Greek manuscripts discovered by me, as for instance, those found in Mr. Mayer's Egyptian Museum, written on

papyrus, which I readily did. The principal journals of the town[42] made the following observations on the occasion:

> BROWN'S FREE LIBRARY-THE MAYOR'S SOIREE. -There were also several large and valuable illustrated books from the Free Library. Glass cases contained the contributions of Mr. Mayer and Dr. Simonides. The latter contributed the following objects:-A genealogical record of the Kings of Egypt, written 300 years after Christ, over which had been written something on a theological subject, in Uncial Greek, of the 6th century; a genealogy, in the sacred character of the Egyptians, with a Greek translation, and several other matters, written on the human skin, during the first century after Christ; the earliest specimens of Greek writing on paper; two early Byzantine drawings on paper; an account of the voyage of Annon, King of Carthage, into Egypt, written 50 years before Christ; a letter relating to the ancient hieroglyphs, in the Greek character, written in the first century after Christ; fragments of the Epistles of St. Jude and St. James, of about the same time. Mr. Mayer contributed some of the earliest Christian documents known to exist. One was part of the 19th chapter of St. Matthew, in the Greek Uncial letter. It contained the 19th verse, and showed that «It is easier for a *cable* to pass through the eye of a needle, &c.». A series of manuscripts belonging to Mr. Mayer showed the progress of the art of writing from the earliest period to the middle of the 16th century, commencing with the Egyptian, and going through the Greek, Saxon, French, Italian, with the Oriental languages, such as the Persian, Arabic, &c. Mr. Mayer also sent an ancient Mexican codex, supposed to relate to astronomy, but written in a language that has been lost since the conquest of Mexico by Spain...

With paticular reference to the Mayer manuscripts *The Christian Remembrancer* July, 1863 states:

> Here, in the recesses of Mr. Mayer's museum, drawn from the obscurity of an Egyptian tomb, and brought to England from Thebes, in 1856, by the Rev. Henry Stobart, whose «name is universally known» *(Facsimiles,* Introd. p. 9), *but who strangely denies that he sold to Mr. Mayer any Greek papyri in the least resembling these,* is the very original copy of S. Matthew's Gospel, «dictated by the Evangelist himself to the deacon Nicolas (Acts, vi. 5), in the fifteenth year after the Lord's Ascension, for the use of the faithful in Palestine, whether Jews or Greeks». Once trust ourselves to the guidance of M. Simonides, and we have lighted upon the most wonderful discovery of the age, the most important in its present results, the most pregnant with happy consequences for the future. We have bridged over

42. e.g. The Liverpool Daily Times (October 19th), The Mercury, The Weekly Mercury and The Daily News (October 20th).

that dreary gulf of nearly three centuries which divides the composition of the sacred autographs from the probable date of our earliest extant copies of the New Testament. We need no more the faint and doubtful light shed upon the inspired text during that dark period by primitive versions, or the loose citations of the Fathers. So far as we possess S. Matthew's own copy of his Gospel, the science of Biblical criticism has no place. We have already, and need not seek by wearisome collation of scattered authorities, the exact words used by the blessed evangelist. Several dubious and open questions, which have perplexed theologians, may now be disposed of for ever. S.Matthew wrote his Gospel very early; wrote for the use of Greek as well as Jewish converts; wrote in Greek, not in Syriac or Hebrew-a fact which, from the days of the Apostles' themselves down to the fourth century, every writer who has' had occasion to refer to the matter has testified. Papias, Irenaeus,' Pantaenus, Origen, Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Epiphanius,' and Jerome, all with one consent affirm this, as Dr. Cureton strongly puts the case he had to maintain. We have presented to our eyes the genuine title-deeds of our holy faith.

After analysing the readings of Matthew in detail *The Christian Remembrancer* July 1863 concludes:

Whether, therefore, we consider these papyrus fragments of the New Testament (1) in regard to the *manner* of their introduction to the world, which must always be a point of some importance when we come to examine the genuiness of writings hitherto unknown; or (2) listen to the evidence of competent scholars (men who have characters to maintain, and no sinister interest to tempt them to deceive us) as to the *external* marks of spuriousness patent on the documents themselves; or (3) note for our own satisfaction the numerous internal symptoms of fraud and interpolation they exhibit, the halting scholarship, and unsupported statements of the editor, the empty verbiage and feeble interpolations of the text; we feel ourselves entitled to draw the conclusion broadly stated by the Council of the Royal Society of Literature in reference to Hermippus' letter to Horus (Report, p. 7), that there are absolute grounds for believing these Biblical papyri to be «*rank forgeries, probably of very recent date*».

The Literary Churchman of course takes the opposite view. The editor takes *The Christian Remembrancer* to task in its issue of 1st September, 1863:

We confess that we are not proud of the tone adopted by public writers towards this Greek. «Old English fairness», of which we have heard much, has displayed itself but little. In the last number of the *Christian Remembrancer,* in a careful article devoted to this subject, Dr. Simonides is twitted with transparent roguery throughout. We have read that paper without being convinced of anything, except that the writer was bent on urging a foregone conclusion. Of course he may have been, and we should think he is, fully convinced of the versatility and dishonesty, the paleographical in-

genuity and bad scholarship, of Dr. Simonides; but his readiness to accept the «Report» of the Royal Society of Literature, which sat in judgment on Dr. Simonides last February, shakes our confidence in this critic. We were present at that meeting to which the Report refers, and our surprise is great at the representation made of what took place. The Greek priest Nicolaides, who was brought forward as the witness to condemn Dr. Simonides, is, we suppose, still in this country; but the entire silence which has been prudently observed respecting him, and the enquiries raised in other quarters as to the trustworthiness of this «archimandrite», (so, we think, he was called), ought in fairness to be remembered, on Dr. Simonides' side. And as to the cursory glance at the papyri being represented as a grave inspection-it is insulting to every one who was there.

In the article before us, there is, we are bound to say, the same spirit of which we complain,-and complain all the more, because the ascertainment of the *truth,* in this matter, concerns Christian literature very deeply.

Critical comments on *The Facsimiles* appeared soon after their publication. A review in *The Athenaeum* on 11th December, 1861 throws the whole affair into perspective, and gives us some background on Simonides' career as a forger:

Is there *no* limit to public credulity? Is there *no* limit to the power of abusing this credulity? M. Simonides is not before the public for the first time; but he has never made a more singular appearance before it than as author of these «Fac-similes». It would seem that in the opinions of some men there is no possible folly that the British people may not be expected to accept and approve, if it be only presented to their notice with the requisite assurance. This view is, indeed, not wholly erroneous. The editor of «Uranius» has found a printer and publisher, and he may, therefore, hope to find a public. When you find an ass's shoe, you may expect to find an ass. Weak and amiable people love to be gulled by an enterprising genius. Lancashire is not so critical as Berlin. After a long silence, M. Simonides speaks from an unexpected Lancashire home, without the fear of Lepsius and his myrmidons, and with the wealth, if not the learning, of Liverpool to sustain him, an «honorary» member of a distinguished northern Society[43], the glory of provincial newspapers, the chosen associate-to quote the words which he so freely and offensively uses of «those who love the Lord». No wonder that he makes the most of a position to which the incredulity of English scholars and the ready zeal of the Berlin police have raised him, and shows how resolutely he still adheres to the character which, some years since, he played in Eastern Europe and Germany.

43. Whether or not Simonides was entitled to call himself an honorary member of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire was the cause of yet more debate over Simonides in 1862. See The Athenaeum 18th January, 25th January, 1st February, 8th February.

After detailing Simonides' earlier career the article goes on to discuss the Mayer manuscripts:

> Most of these extraordinary fragments M. Simonides declares he found among the papyri collected by the Rev. H. Stobart, and now in Mr. Mayer's Museum at Liverpool. The remainder are said to have belonged to a once well-known dealer in curiosities, Mr. Sams. M. Simonides appears to have made Mr. Mayer acquainted as quickly as possible with his discoveries; and that gentleman, with laudable zeal, at once assembled an archaeological meeting in his Museum, May 1, 1860, to whom he communicated them. The local journals vied with each other and with a London literary journal in trumpeting forth the wonderful news. «Many of the learned in Liverpool», says M. Simonides, «called on me in order to see the passages, and, after a minute inspection, heartily glorified God». Could M. Simonides oblige mankind with the names of these Liverpool sages? Many wise men of the metropolis, we are also told, saw these fragments, and were delighted at these discoveries; especially «the amiable and truly evangelical family of N. Banyard, Esq., who invited to their house, for the purpose of seeing and examining the fragments, several learned persons, all of whom were in ecstasies at the sight, and particularly the brother of Mrs. Banyard, a genuine servant of the Lord (whose name, unfortunately, I do not remember), who took for his text at evening devotions the 28th of St. Matthew, and offered up prayer and thanksgiving for the discovery of these sacred fragments of the oldest version of the New Testament!» What a pity that M. Simonides should have forgotten the name of this «genuine servant of the Lord». Perhaps it may be recovered. What reason, scholars will ask, is there for putting more faith in this work of M. Simonides than in his previous labours, seeing that exposure has no terrors for him, and that he is ready to bring forward again, in 1861, what has been repeatedly shown in previous years to be forgeries? Perhaps he rests his claim to be heard again on the portrait of St. Matthew, which forms the frontispiece of his new work, and which, he says, «was executed in the fifth century by Hierotheus of Thessalonica, the saint portrait painter...The original is preserved among frescoes of Athos. The copy here given was taken from it by C.S.». Fifth century, indeed! either language must have lost its usual meaning or Mr. Simonides must have gone stark mad. Byzantine art! why the original of this portrait, if, indeed, there be any original at Athos, is assuredly later than the times of Raphael or Michael Angelo, probably of a date not earlier than 1600? If M. Simonides really believes that such a portrait could be of the fifth century, the fact only proves that he knows no more of Art than of Theology and History.
>
> The reader will have gathered from what we have already stated our opinion of the documents; but it may not be wholly useless to subject them to a closer examination. Now, in the first place, we consider it would require nothing short of a miracle to bring together in one place, at the bid-

ding of any one person, so extraordinary a collection of rarities as M. Simonides avers he has found in Mayer's Museum during the researches of only two or three days. It may not be generally known, but it is an undoubted fact, that no MSS. of any kind, if we except the Hieratic papyri, are known to ascend to the first or second century, and that of those of the fourth or fifth there are not more than five or six throughout all the libraries of Europe; yet M. Simonides, if he is to be believed, has got these wonders «plenty as blackberries», there being, as it would seem, no limit to the treasures with which he kindly proposes to flood the world. Again, when we remember with what zeal the MS. treasures of antiquity have been hunted during the last three centuries, and especially within the last fifty years, we may pronounce it wholly past belief that so many and such valuable fragments should be huddled together in one small collection. More than this, as regards Mr. Stobart's papyri, though it may be true they were not all minutely examined while in the Museum, yet sufficient research was made among them to detect «The Funeral Oration of Hyperides over Leosthenes», which has been edited so admirably by the Rev. C. Babington. It could hardly be that every one of the important documents M. Simonides professes to have discovered among them should have been overlooked during the researches then made. On these and similar grounds, we hold that the *a priori* evidence against M. Simonides' new discoveries is irresistible. We are, however, prepared to go much further than this, and to declare, unreservedly, that we have no confidence whatever in any one of the documents he has just put forward; and this, not from the subject-matter of which they treat, but from the manner in which these MSS. have been made. We may add our belief, that there is not one person, however little acquainted with palaeography, who will not condemn them wholly at the first glance; and more than this, that a careful examination of them has convinced us, that they are quite modern, and probably the work of some scribe of the nineteenth century. Of course, we have no means of knowing how it is that they have found their way into Mr. Mayer's Museum, nor how many of them may actually have belonged to either Mr. Stobart or Mr. Sams. Bur if they are the product of one scribe—as would appear on the face of them—it is remarkable that they should have been found in one collection, in such suspicious company as Uranius & Co. and under the supervision and editing of M. Simonides. That the handwriting of all of them is that of one and the same person, we appeal with confidence to every one who has any acquaintance with early MSS. Let them compare, for istance, the Us, Es, As, Ds, and they will not fail to perceive running through them all the most striking family likeness-a resemblance too remarkable to be the result of accident, and such as we nowhere find in genuine MSS. differing by centuries in date. The examiner will further notice, or we are greatly mistaken, on some of the MSS. what may be called fanciful of impossible letters; in other words, such letters as

are met with nowhere else, and which we should be justified in declaring are not ancient Greek at all. We allude particularly to the transcript of a stone said to have been found at Thyatira, and published here in Place I.B, p. 14. With some knowledge of paleography, we do not scruple to say that we have never yet seen a Greek inscription containing such a jumble of characters as this page presents; while among them we observe also a MS. H if not some other letters, the form of which, so far as they resemble anything Greek, approach more nearly to MS. than to lapidary writing.

But our space warns us that we must bring to conclusion an article which, to do full justice to M. Simonides, might easily be extended through many pages. We omit, therefore, to remark on the theological bearing of these presumed discoveries and make no remarks on the words of many of his so-called ancient MSS., which read to our ears, in many cases, strangely like the most modern schoolboy's Greek We are compelled also to pass over the interesting fact that M. Simonides speaks of an inscription proving that Pontius Pilate's wife was named Pempele, with his argument that, in the Received Text of the New Testament, the name Πεμπελη has been corrupted into Επεμψεν!! and his still more elaborate reasonings (mainly founded, as he asserts, on unpublished MSS. still in his possession) to prove the now well-settled question, whether St. Matthew's Gosepl was first written in Greek or Hebrew. All these points will, we doubt not, be duly handled long by competent critics and scholars; nor will any one of those who can read the Greek Delectus, be found, we imagine, to accept either the MSS. or the arguments of M. Simonides.

For the same reason, we are compelled to pass over M. Simonides' further claim to have made known to the world the discovery of *Heliotypy,* which, he asserts, also from a MS. in his safe keeping, to have been invented by one Panselenus in the fourth century, and to have been stolen (from information received at Mount Athos) by a certain Frenchman named Daguerre; to say nothing of the properties of gun-cotton (Βαμβακοπυριτις), which M. Simonides, from an equally authentic source, published to the world in 1843, in a tract entitled, Χημικὰ 'Αθωιτῶν. So, too, we can only mention that M. Simonides professes to possess, indeed exhibited at the opening of the Brown Free Library, at Liverpool, an «Egyptian theological work in hieroglyphics, with a Greek translation, by Melambus, written on human (female) skin in the first century after Christ»; and, also, a Greek poem, by «Oenopides», written on prepared human (female) skin,[44] of the same date; though by what ingenuity M. Simonides can detect whether his presumed skin be male or female, is hard enough to conjecture.

Mr. Mayer, if he values his collection, should be more careful how he uses his MS. treasures. The Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire has

44. The British Museum pamphlet The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrius (1951) regrets that the Liverpool Museum does not still possess «this confection» (p. 9f).

surprised everybody by their selection of an «honorary» member. Our own opinion is, that not one of these pretended documents is genuine. We are not alarmed by the threat which M. Simonides levels against all those who object to his pretended relics of antiquity. We are content to share the abuse levelled at Dr. Cureton, Dr. Tregelles, and the authorities of the British Museum.

As the above review throws suspicion not only on Simonides but also on Henry Stobart, both these men duly replied to the *Athenaeum*. Stobart's letter appeared on 14th December, 1861 and cast doubt on Simonides' activities:

> I have just read in last week's number of the *Athenaeum* your critique upon «Fac-Similes of Certain Portions of the Gospel of St. Matthew, and of the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude, written on Papyrus in the First Century». I feel sure that, as my name is brought forward in your review in connexion with these MSS. as their professed discoverer, you will allow me to clear myself, as I think it right at once to do, from any share in their publication, and from any attempt, therefore, which you believe there exists, to impose on the credulity of the «British public».
>
> Some three or four years ago Mr. Mayer, among other antiquities, obtained some MSS. on papyrus from me, which I had brought myself from Thebes in Egypt. At the time they came into Mr. Mayer's hands they had not been fully unrolled. They were, at any rate, however, *genuine* MSS.; but *all* of them, I believe, in the Hieratic character, and containing portions, most probably, of the ancient Egyptian Ritual. If Mr. Birch's memory serves him, I think he would confirm this, as they were inspected by him. I never heard more of these MSS. until about a year ago I happened to be in Liverpool and saw Dr. Simonides, who showed me a *small piece* of papyrus, on which was written, in the uncial character, a few verses of the xixth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel. I spoke to Mr. Mayer afterwards about it, and he told me that Dr. Simonides believed that among the same lot of MSS., which he said were those he had obtained from me, he had discovered *other* portions of the same Gospel. I confess that I was greatly surprised, and felt great doubts of these fragments having ever formed part of any of the MSS. which had been in my possesion.
>
> The next I heard of the subject (except from an occasional short reference to the assumed discoveries in local papers) was from a letter of a Correspondent of the *Guardian,* under date August 14th of this year, which spoke of the forthcoming publication of these «Fac-Similes». In this letter I was astounded by the information, that «there is reason to suppose that one of the papyri is the *original copy* of St. Matthew's Gospel, written by Nicholaus of Antioch at the personal dictation of the Apostle». I *at once* wrote to Mr. Mayer to ask for information, and to express my astonishment at the magnitude of Dr. Simonides' discoveries, and to say that I trusted he had been very careful to assure himself that these MSS. had really come out of his Collection. I naturally felt that both Mr. Mayer and myself might be

exposed to unpleasant reflections in case any deception was being practised. Up to this date I have received no reply from Mr. Mayer, nor have I myself yet seen the publication of the «Fac-Similes».

I make this simple statement to you, trusting to free myself from my responsibility connected with the publication. I leave it to others to settle the question of the genuineness of the MSS. All I can say is, that I cannot myself believe that they were ever in my possession. I examined my own MSS. sufficiently to feel convinced that they were in the Hieratic character. If you will allow this letter to appear in your next number, you will oblige, Yours, &c.,

Henry Stobart.

P.S. I think you are in error in a statement that «it is an *undoubted fact* that *no MSS of any kind,* if we except the Hieratic papyri, are known to ascend to the first or second century». I brought home with me from Egypt in 1855, I think, four wooden tablets covered with manuscript, written upon a kind of cement, which contained a series of astronomical observations, in the Demotic character, made in the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian. They are in Mr. Mayer's Museum, and have been translated by Dr. Brugsch of Berlin, and published both in English and French-the observations having been submitted both to Mr. Airy ant to M. Biot, and their truth confirmed by them. An account of them can be seen in one of the papers read before the Astronomical Society in, I think, the year 1855, and their date is unquestionably that of the second century.

I would only add, also, with reference to another remark in your review, that «The Funeral Oration of Hyperides» which was also brought home by me from Egypt, was not selected by Sir F. Madden from among the MSS, now in Mr. Mayer's possession. It was offered to the British Museum along with some Coptic MSS. in the Greek character, *all* of which were purchased by the Museum, and I am sorry to say have never yet been published. It is right that I should mention this, as your remark might lead your readers to infer that the MSS., which Mr. Mayer obtained from me, had been rejected as spurious by the British Museum, which was in no wise the case.

The editor then appends:

Mr. Stobart's postscript requires from us a word of explanation. We do not for a moment doubt that Mr. Stobart brought the tablets of which he speaks from the East, and that they ascend, as he says, to an early period. Their value is above suspicion, and they ought assuredly to have been secured for the National Library. We meant to say that no *such MS* as the fac-similes of M. Simonides are known to exist. Of course Coptic Papyri exist; but about this class of document there is no discussion whatever. May we venture to offer a suggestion to Mr. Stobart? Why not go down to Liverpool and inspect the MSS. which he sold to Mr. Mayer? He would be able, probably, to recognize his own collections, and to state whether they are in exactly the same condition as when he brought them from the East.

The reply by Simonides occurred in the following week's issue and in it he refers not only to the review but also to Stobart's letter:

> The list of fragments of works written upon papyrus, and unrolled by me at Mr. Mayer's Museum, is correct. These papyri are all at Liverpool, and can be examined by those interested in the subject by a proper application to Mr. Mayer. Their number and importance is in your eyes a crime, which unfortunately it is not in my power to extenuate. That you should have some to an *a priori* decision that, from my presumed antecedents, they are not genuine, is an error which I think you will live to regret, and I am sure that those who are really interested in palaeography will prefer the result of their own inspection to the *ipse dixit* of a writer who has never even seen what he writes of with so much confidence. It is to be regretted that you see no cause for thankfulness to God in the discovery of the earliest MSS. of the New Testament extant...
>
> ...It is impossible here to discuss the question of the date of the portrait of St. Matthew or of the forms of the letters upon which you have pronounced so emphatic an opinion; these matters will receive the attention of scholars, who will perhaps devote to them a little more time, learning and research than you can be expected to afford, and it is possible that you may regret having taken so definite a position on grounds so slight. As, however, you have assumed the post of instructor to the unlearned public, perhaps you will inform them in your next number on what authority you make the monstrous assertion, that «it may not be generally known, but is an undoubted fact, that no MSS. of any kind, if we except the Hieratic papyri, are known to ascend to the first or second centuries». What will your readers think when they are told that they have only to refer to Silvestre's Palaeography to find that you have made the trifling error of half-a-dozen centuries, and that they may inspect in that work fac-similes of *Greek MSS. on papyrus* of as early a date as the third century *before* the Christian Era, viz. 1st one of part of Dioscorides, second or third centuries B.C. 2nd. Fragments of Homer, &c. third century B.C. 3rd. A petition to Ptolemy, second century B.C. 4th A musical treatise found at Herculaneum first centuty B.C. 5th. A cursive MS. of the second century A.D. This gross and fundamental error may perhaps show on what sort of evidence you would crush out of existence documents which will nevertheless assert their right to critical investigation, and will hardly be pronounced spurious on the strength of your declamation, however impetuous. '
>
> I should have liked, had the space which I expect to be allotted been greater, to have touched on the last of your remarks; but I think I have said enough to show the public that your *matter* is not reliable; and I have now a word to add, in conclusion, as to your *manner*. This is intemperate, vindictive, unchristian. You adopt a scriptural euphemism to veil the name of *liar* which you seek to fasten upon me, and you present, as facts, to a public

which has no means of checking your assertions, a mass of *ex parte* statements which I have easy means of controverting. This is not the temper in which to review a work, the *sole* object of which is to present to the English public fresh information on an all important subject; and I should be sorry, though no one could be surprised, were I to reply in the same spirit.

Lastly, to bring to an issue the various questions concerning the Interpretation of Hieroglyphics and Cuneiform Letters which have been raised by you and by your contemporaries, I hereby challenge those who are learned in these matters to a public discussion of the subject in *London* at as early a period as can be arranged. Let any monument in the British Museum be selected, bearing inscriptions in either of these forms; and I will give, in writing, my interpretation of the same in the original languages and in Greek, with my authorities for such interpretation. Any committee of literary men who may be appointed shall also take the same inscription, and deal with it in the same manner, and the results of our investigation shall then be placed side by side before the public for their examination. An opportunity will thus be afforded for testing the real knowledge which is possessed upon these subjects, and those who believe me to have erroneous ideas will have the means of confuting me.

I beg to request your insertion of this letter in your journal of the 21st instant, and remain Sir, your obedient servant,

C. Simonides.

P.S.-Since my letter was written, I have seen, in the *Athenaeum* of December the 14th, a letter from Mr. Stobart, in which that gentleman appears anxious to disclaim any previous property in the Greek MSS. which I have unrolled for Mr. Mayer. It was impossible that I should be able to speak *from my own knowledge* as to the sources from which Mr. Mayer obtained his papyri, and I was dependent upon his information; he was under the impression that all which were deposited in one case were purchased from Mr. Stobart, and all in another from Mr. Sams. As, however, no accurate distinction has been made it is probably almost impossible now to ascribe each papyrus to its original owner. Besides a considerable number of rolls which contain only Demotic characters, it will be remembered that I have unrolled two which contain Demotic writing and Greek translation, and three very large fragments of Hieratic writing only. It would puzzle Mr. Stobart or any other gentleman to tell, from the external appearance of a roll, in which language the *whole* of its contents would prove to be, as in very many instances several different documents are contained one within the other. There are several papyri not yet unrolled in Mr. Mayer's Museum, which may afford confirmation of my remarks.

To this the editor adds a footnote:

To this note we have only one or two words to add. The facts about M. Simonides given in our article were published in Germany five or six years ago, and were not contradicted; they were reproduced in England two or three years ago, and were not then corrected. We treated these statements, therefore, as public property-gave them as we found them, and our readers can now judge whether the attempt to qualify them has been successful in any material point. Last week we disposed of the misconception of our meaning about the age of ancient Manuscripts. We were speaking of the fac-similes of M. Simonides, and our words could have no other meaning than that no *such* Manuscripts are known to ascend so high as the first or second century. Dr. Mordtmann can defend himself; he is certainly one of the most learned men alive; and, as a linguist, has no rivals except Lord Strangford and Mr. Alison, our minister at Teheran. We will not affront him by a word in his defence against such an assailant. If M. Simonides is willing to exhibit his documents, in London, let him write to Mr. Norris, Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society. We have no doubt the Society will give him a hearing, as the press has given him one.

Like Stobart, Mayer also wrote to *The Athenaeum* to clear himself of complicity in Simonides' story: the letter appeared on 28th December, 1861:

You have in your review of the recent publication of Dr. Simonides made use of my name. I therefore claim the insertion of a few lines defining my own position in reference to the Papyri which you have thought proper to notice in such unqualified terms of distrust. The simple facts are, that the MSS. of which the fac-similes are before the public, are part only of a collection which I acquired from two different sources, viz. from the late Mr. Sams and from the Rev. H. Stobart, and as they have been disarranged more than once in my museum, it is not in my power to state with perfect accuracy from which of these two sources any particular Papyrus was derived.

Dr. Simonides was introduced to me, as stated by him, at my museum; and after we had been acquainted for some time, and he had given me in writing his interpretation of several of the Hieroglyphical Inscriptions in the Museum, I requested him to unroll and decipher for me some of many rolls of Papyrus which were on my shelves; and he shortly afterwards commenced his operations in the Library of the Museum, the necessary materials for the unrolling, such as linen, starch, &c., being supplied by the Curator, who attended on him, and with myself saw many of the MSS. opened.

Dr. Simonides told me during the time that he was thus engaged that the Papyri were of extreme Biblical interest, and from time to time the results of his discoveries were communicated to the papers.

I leave to Dr. Simonides himself the vindication of his character from the charges brought against him; but it is absolutely necessary that the public be made aware that the Papyri in question are in no way connected

with Dr. Simonides, except in as far as he has unrolled and illustrated them, and that they are, and have been for some years, the property of, yours respectfully,

Joseph Mayer

This letter is reproduced by Simonides himself in the Prolegomena to his edition of the *Periplus* of Hannon.

A sequel to the above appeared in *The Athenaeum* on 25th January, 1862 with another letter of Simonides:

I have to thank you for inserting in your paper of Dec. 21st my answer to your review of the work I have just edited, containing the fac-similes of the Mayer MSS. I have now only a few words to add, in reply to the editorial note you appended thereto. You state that the «facts about M. Simonides, given in our article, were published in Germany five or six years ago, and were not then corrected».

To this I have to say, that I wrote at the time to the German newspaper that gave birth to the calumnies, and contradicted them in the most emphatic manner. That contradiction was not published, owing to influences[45] to which I need not now refer; but I otherwise exerted myself in every possible manner to make public my denial of those statements, and in at least one instance my denials came under your own notice. Some short time since you were so kind as to notice, not unfavourably, a work of mine, then just published, entitled «The Four Theological Writings of Nicholas, Bishop of Methone, &c.,» which contained refutations of many of the German false statements: and at the same time you reviewed a biographical memoir of myself, written by an English gentleman who possesses a personal knowledge of the facts, which memoir contains a sketch of my life and labours correct in every essential particular. With this biography before you, which completely answers the German fabrications, I think it unfair of you to say they have never been contradicted; and I now call your reviews to your mind in order to induce you to do me the justice of admitting that the German calumnies have been contradicted both by myself and friends, and that you fell into an error by saying «they were reproduced in England two or three years ago, and were not then corrected».

With regard to your concluding remark, recommending the exhibition of the documents before the Royal Asiatic Society, I have to say that the documents are not mine to exhibit. They are Mr. Mayer's, and with him rests the power of exhibition. My connexion with the Mayer MSS. is confined to unrolling them, deciphering them, and editing the work containing their fac-similes. Permit me to add, that I have the greatest respect for the Royal Asiatic Society, and should feel honoured if they would inspect the MSS. in my possession. I may conclude by observing that I propose, pro-

45. Could this refer to Tischendorf and his allies?

bably during the present month, to exhibit in London a collection of such treasures of antiquity as I have now with me in this country, that they may be inspected and freely examined by the learned of all the English Societies.

C. Simonides

Again the editor adds another shrewd footnote which reveals Simonides' methods:

> M. Simonides appears to consider that the German accusations were contradicted by a letter to a newspaper which that newspaper never printed, and the particular statement of Mr. Leigh Sotheby's book, by Mr. Stewart's little pamphlet. That is not our opinion, or the world's opinion. We never heard of M. Simonides' unpublished letter, and Mr. Stewart's pamphlet was not a contradiction by M. Simonides himself. We are sorry to see that he declines the initiative in procuring an exhibition of the MSS. in dispute before the Royal Asiatic Society.

As we have seen the Royal Society of Literature examined Simonides palimpsest of Uranius in February 1863. The previous month the Mayer manuscripts were reconsidered.

Trübner and Company of London who had published several of Simonides' works printed in 1863, *the Report of the Council of the Royal Society of Literature, on the exhibition of some papyri belonging to Mr. Mayer, of Liverpool, and of the MS. «Uranius» belonging to M. Simonides,* written by Sir Henry C. Rawlinson. This report was read on the 11th of February, 1863:

> On Friday and Saturday, January 9th and 10th, a collection of Papyri from Mr. Mayer's Museum at Liverpool was placed upon the table of the Royal Society of Literature for the examination of such gentlemen as might be desirous of seeing them. Among those who availed themselves of this opportunity were Sir F. Madden, K.H., Sir Charles Nicholson, Bart., Dr. Birch, Mr. Bonomi, the Rev. Dr. Cureton, Dr. Hunt, Mr. James Yates, Sir H.C. Rawlinson, K.C.B., Mr. Bond, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Poole, the Rev. Mr. Hugo, Mr. Goodwin, and Dr. Guest. M. Simonides, accompanied by one of his Greek friends, was present during the whole time, and Mr. Hugo, Dr. Guest, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Bonomi, and Mr. Vaux attended during portions of each day, to represent the Society, as Members of its Council.
>
> No formal decision was come to on either of these days with regard to the documents in question; that, indeed, being scarcely within the scope of the exhibition; the judgment, however, of nearly all who saw them was decidedly adverse to the genuiness of any of the MSS. so exhibited.
>
> It was remarked, *inter alia,* that there was a manifest similarity in the handwriting of the whole of the papyri, although these professed to be of various epochs differing by centuries; and that letters of very different dates and of widely distinctive character, were frequently found in juxtaposition in the same papyrus, to such an extent, that, had they been met with in any

mediaeval document, a manuscript containing them would undoubtedly have been rejected as spurious.

Occasionally, too, the presumed ancient letters on the papyri bore a strangely suspicious resemblance to the characters of the modern Greek inscriptions placed over the head of each MS.: suggesting the idea that one and the same hand might possibly have written both.

Again, it was noticed that the colour of the papyri was, with two or three exceptions, wholly different from that invariably found on genuine documents of the same professed age and character, offering the strong probability that the papyri had been purposely discoloured before the present writing was put upon them. Lastly, it was observed that portions of papyri of different textures had been joined together so as to make up one piece; while it was asserted by more than one observer, that papyri differing in date by more than a thousand years had been pasted side by side. In many places, where there were rents, natural or accidental, in the substance of the papyri, the writing on them was bent in such a manner as to fit the existing crack or hole; and occasionally, as in fragment No. 7, the writing has been written round a rent previously made. Attention was also called to the breadth of these pieces of papyrus, or rather, to the unusual length of the lines of writing on the majority of them; a fact which would lead to much suspicion as to their genuineness on the part of those best versed in palaeographic studies.

Attention was called to the fact that the papyri exhibited were all fastened down (with one exception) on linen, in such a manner that it was impossible to see what had been on their reverse sides; and that, thus, no opinion could be formed as to the state of the papyrus when first unrolled, or whether there had been any hieratic or other writing on it, as is usually found in genuine documents. Although many questions were put to M. Simonides on this subject, the answers were evasive, and no more could be learnt than had been already published two years before by M. Simonides, viz. that he had unrolled from time to time certain papyri in Mr. Mayer's museum, and that he was, subsequently, permitted to take some portions of them to his own house for the purpose of deciphering them at his leisure.

In denial of the statement of M. Simonides that these papyri formed part of the collections of Mr. Stobart and of the late Mr. Sams, it was stated publicly by more than one gentleman who had repeatedly seen and handled both of these collections before they came into the possession of Mr. Mayer, that the MSS. exhibited bore no resemblance to any in those collections, and that Mr. Stobart himself, on the publication of Mr. Mayer's specimens, had expressed a similar opinion in the pages of the «Athenaeum».

One papyrus was subjected to *minute* examination by a competent scholar, Mr. C.W. Goodwin. This document Mr. Goodwin found to contain at the top some lines of Greek writing, professing to be part of a letter

from one Hermippus to his friend Horus. It is partially illegible, but has, in places, been retouched by an unskilful hand. After a space, it proceeds to notice a king of Diospolis, and adds «that he wrote in hieratic writing upon the gate of a temple;» the hieratic inscription he is asserted to have written immediately following.

Mr. Goodwin states that this inscription, which he recognizes as genuine, is part of one of those usually buried with the bodies of the dead; the name of the person with whom the papyrus was buried having been actually preserved. There can be no question, therefore, that the passage is simply funereal, and that it never was or could have been inscribed on the *pylon* of a temple. On further inspection, Mr. Goodwin noticed, upon the portion of the papyrus now covered with Greek writing, some small flecks of blotting-paper; and, from this, drew the natural inference that the upper portions of the Hieratic text had been removed by pressing on them damp blotting-paper, so as to admit of the subsequent insertion of the explanatory lines in Greek. It having been denied by M. Simonides that the writing could be so removed, Mr. Goodwin made the experiment, successfully, himself, on portions of two papyri, one of the eighth century B.C., and another of about the same date after Christ. There are absolute grounds, therefore, for concluding that the papyrus examined by Mr. Goodwin is a rank forgery, probably of very recent date.

Following the January meeting an apologia by Hodgkin appeared in *Parthenon* 31st January 1863 (and was reprinted in *The Journal of Sacred Literature*, July 1863).[46] In attempting to absolve Simonides from forging the Mayer manuscripts, Hodgkin reveals some of Simonides' other alleged malpractices:

The assumption that Mr. Mayer (whilst taking no active part in the exhibition of the papyri, and not entering into controversy upon their merits) is desirous of hearing the opinions of all comers as to the *value* of his manuscripts, is perfectly correct; though he does not need public opinion to convince his own mind of their *genuineness*. But, in justice to that gentleman, it should also be remembered that he has done more than merely exhibit his treasures; he long ago published an account of the unrolling of the papyri, which should have prevented your making the disparaging statement that «the exact circumstances under which Simonides unrolled the papyri are extremely difficult to come at: it is stated that the unrolling took place at Mr. Mayer's house». If you will refer to the *Athenaeum* of December 28, 1861[47] you will find a letter from Mr. Mayer, in which a complete though succinct account is given of the unrolling of the papyri in his *museum*. If more details are required than are contained in this letter, and if the word of Simonides is not to be taken, application should be made to Mr.

46. Much of the correspondence regarding the Mayer MSS. may be seen in the Hodgkin files at the British Library (Additional MS. 42502A folio 358-388).
47. This is reproduced on p. 151 f.

Mayer for a more explicit narrative; and when that gentleman declines to furnish all the information in his power, and not till then, will it be allowable to make such a statement as that above referred to.

I venture to suggest, in the second place, that if the object be to give to the public an opportunity of forming a correct judgment, the facts, whether more or less recent, should be given with as much precision as possible; and that if it were necessary to make the statement, that Simonides produced in England, in 1853, certain manuscripts which were at once pronounced to be forgeries, it should have been made in so circumstantial a manner that the ordinary reader might have the opportunity of discovering the names of the *experts* who gave the decision, and the grounds upon which their judgment was arrived at; for if the public, who will have forgotten the details of the present discussion in 1873, are then merely told that in 1863 Simonides exhibited in London a manuscript of Hermippus, which was *pronounced* to be a forgery, they will be as unreasonably prejudiced against him as they are likely to be by the bold statement just referred to. I suppose the manuscripts of which you speak were those submitted to the Royal Society of Literature, and for the examination of which a special committee was appointed, whose report, if brought before the public at the present juncture, would be of service,-not, it is true, in the determination of the genuineness or spuriousness of the manuscripts lately exhibited, but in their appreciation of the character of the discoverer. Would the Society object to the publication of this report?

Your observations are confined to the papyri on which are inscribed the letters of Hermippus, and especially to the long letter which contains a hieratic inscription in the midst of a Greek text. The latter was so far from forming what you considered a reasonable accompaniment to the five genuine hieratic lines, that these appeared to you like an island of truth floating in the midst of a red sea of falsehood. You accordingly made a close examination of the physical aspect of the manuscripts. Whilst it will be seen that I venture to differ entirely from the conclusion to which you were led by this examination, I would earnestly invite the more careful inspection of the physical peculiarities of all the papyri of Mr. Mayer, as I believe that, after diligent microscopic scrutiny, each fragment may be pronounced genuine or spurious upon external evidence. The nature of the discovery next made was twofold:-1. A general muddy pink tint. 2. Little flecks of blotting paper. Now a pink tint caused upon the surface of papyrus by the application of blotting paper, not resolvable by a low magnifying power into distinct specks, must be in reality a *stain, caused by the discharge of the red colouring matter and its retention on the surface.*

I assert that not only does no pinkish stain of any kind exist upon the surface of this papyrus, but also (after repeated experiment) that it is physically impossible to communicate any such stain to papyrus by the ap-

plication of blotting-paper in any way which ingenuity can suggest; and I respectfully challenge you to exhibit in public, at the next meeting of the Royal Society of Literature, your *modus operandi*, or to make a disclaimer of this part of your statement. I need hardly say that if the tint *were* resolvable, an almost infinite number of infinitely small specks would be needed for its production.

The second discovery was that of the little flecks of actual blotting-paper which exist upon the surface, not only of this, but of other papyri in the collection. And from this point I wonder that you did not carry on your reasoning one step. Granted that the surface of the papyrus had been freed from its hieratic contents in the way suggested, in what relation to the Greek characters would the blotting-paper have been found? *Under* them, of course; but, as was pointed out at the exhibition of the papyri, the only specks of blotting-paper which exist are *over* the letters, and one, large enough to be the father of all the rest, is unfortunately on the hieratic inscription. One cannot help feeling that those who are really qualified to be the teachers of the people should take a great deal more pains in their investigations before pronouncing a judgment. In the present instance I am sure that you were led away by finding what appeared to you a gross inconsistency, and that this feeling unconsciously tinged your subsequent examination. It was due to your readers to have alluded to the statement made by myself at the meeting of the Royal Society of Literature, that Simonides used red blotting-paper in the process of opening the fragment of St. John's Gospel which he unrolled at my house, and that this amply accounted for the presence of any number of little specks of that material, which would adhere wherever there was on the surface a spot of the paste used in fixing the papyrus to the calico.

In conclusion, I must be allowed to remark, that I believe no person, however skilful in the detection of fraud, would have come, after an unbiassed examination, however minute, to the same conclusion as yourself.

I speak with some little confidence, as I have been engaged in the rather arduous task of spelling out letter by letter with a magnifying-glass the whole of the contents of this papyrus, and I can unhesitatingly say that not the slightest symptom exists of any difference of texture or surface between the portion covered by the hieratic, and that covered by the Greek text; but that, on the contrary, the whole writing is incontestably written with the same ink: and the same lapse of time, be it longer or shorter, has left its unmistakeable traces upon hieratic and Greek letters alike. I shall perhaps be allowed to make some remarks on the test of this manuscript at the next meeting of the Royal Society of Literature, when, with the permission of the council, it will be again exhibited.

John Eliot Hodgkin.

Simonides himself reprinted this letter in his edition of the *Periplus* of Hannon in 1864.

A telling footnote appeared when the letter was reprinted in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* July 1863.

> (I have but very few words to say upon the above. Mr. Mayer's letter in the *Athenaeum* of December 28, 1861, does not tell us what opportunities Simonides had of manipulating the papyri without witnesses. Mr. Mayer is confessedly unable to identify the papyri now produced with those which he saw unrolled. With regard to the pink tint, whether Mr. Hodgkin can see it or not, I can but repeat that I saw something which appeared such to me, and that it led to the discovery of small flecks of blotting-paper (of which the existence is admitted), which are decidedly pink. As to the exact position of these flecks I will not venture to speak, not having the papyrus at hand, except in regard to the large piece alluded to by Mr. Hodgkin as being on the hieratic inscription. I recollect such a fleck, which is, if I am not deceived, towards the edge of the hieratic text, and in that part which has obviously been partially erased, and retouched by an ignorant hand.
>
> Blotting-paper may have been used, for aught I know, for other purposes besides that of erasure. That Mr. Hodgkin saw it employed in some way or other, in the process of unrolling which he witnessed, proves nothing.
>
> It has puzzled some persons to explain whence a sufficient quantity of blank papyrus could have been obtained for the whole of the Greek texts produced by Simonides. When the fragments are torn, ragged, and dirty, the idea of the erasure of a previous text naturally presents itself. There are some large specimens, however, in very good condition. I take this opportunity to suggest that these may be written on the backs of papyrus rolls, which, more often than not, are free from writing, and would afford ample space. The other sides being pasted down, it may be difficult or impossible to find out now what writing they may have borne.—*C. W.* Goodwin .

In reply to this footnote Hodgkin wrote to *The Parthenon* on 7th February, 1863, in the following way:

> Sir, I am glad to have it in my power to offer something more than a recapitulation of my former assertions in reply to your short appendix to my letter of last week. I stated at the meeting of the Royal Society of Literature, in reply to a query from Mr. Vaux, that Mr. Mayer was unable to identify any of the Papyri then exhibited as having been formerly in his Museum. I took for granted Mr. Mayer's statement to me that they could not be positively identified, and could make no other reply. I had expected that the Society would have examined the manuscripts principally on their own merits, and that the exact links in their previous history would have been less regarded than their physical peculiarities, as I conceive it to be impossible so cleverly to forge documents of this class that the eye of a laborious and systematic scrutator shall ultimately be deceived. Being entirely unprepared for this perfectly legitimate inquiry as to the possibility of

tracing the manuscripts from the shelves of Mr. Mayer to the table on which they were then displayed, I had made no enquiries upon the subject, except from Mr. Mayer, who, being unable to identify them positively himself, though satisfied, on other grounds, of their genuineness, seems to have taken no further steps in the affair.

A few days ago it occurred to me that the Curator of the Museum, in whose presence the Papyri were unrolled, would be able to give some information about them. I have, accordingly, on several occasions, questioned him very closely upon every matter which occurred to me touching the opening of these manuscripts. He unhesitatingly assured me, in reply to my queries, that all the Papyri but four were opened in the library of the Museum; that the operation of laying down and adjusting the fragments of those which were in bad condition occupied Simonides, in many instances, two or three days, in consequence of the shattered state of the Papyrus, which in many of the rolls, was so dry and crumbling as to fall to pieces in moving from one part of the case to the other; that Simonides worked hard for several weeks, unrolling, tracing, and deciphering, and that he freely explained, not only to Mr. Mayer, but also to those visitors who wished to see the manuscripts, their nature and contents; that the library in which he worked was accessible to all visitors, and that he, the Curator, was in the room at intervals throughout the day, and supplied him with such materials as he required; that the manuscripts never left the library at all before the meeting held in the Museum on the 1st of May, 1860, when the announcement was made by Mr. Mayer of the important nature of some of their contents, and that the bulk of them remained there, under lock and key, until the 7th of August when the whole of them passed into the possession of Simonides, for the completion of the fac-similes; that Simonides at first traced the manuscripts in the library, and that it was only after his illness and his absence (for some two months) that on account of the close and unwholesome air of the Museum, he commenced to trace them at home. In reply to my query whether he could indentify the Papyri if he saw them, he said he could, and especially described several of them by their shape and other peculiarities.

I have since shown to the Curator all the Papyri in my possession, including the long letter of Hermippos, and the fragment containing a portion of the history of Carthage, and he immediately recognised them all; the two latter he described as having come out of the same large roll, which contained a considerable number of pieces; he informed me of his own accord from which case he took it, and added that it was one of Mr. Stobart's manuscripts, and that he remembers their coming to the Museum, and still has the tin boxes in which they were preserved. Though these Papyri of Mr. Stobart's were stronger than some of the others, they were extremely fragile, and only capable of being unrolled a very little way; and as a con-

siderable number of pieces of different descriptions were contained in the same roll, it was, in my opinion, quite impossible for Mr. Stobart to pronounce upon the character of more than the external coil. I have also shown to the Curator the fac-similes published by Simonides, a copy of which he had never seen before, and I feel these are exact imitations of the Papyri which he saw unrolled. I do not, of course, mean to assert that the more important portions of the fragment of St. John's Gospel which I saw opened; his testimony is that of an ordinary honest and attentive observer, who has had a set of objects for so long a period continually under his eyes as to become well acquainted with their general characteristics. He is a straightforward, plain-speaking man, and his evidence is natural, and manifestly sincere.

I would suggest that if any gentlemen have a particular desire to trace the history of these Papyri, they should cross-examine this witness in London, as I think it very likely that Mr. Mayer would spare him for a couple of days for that purpose.

I must now say a few words on the «blotting-paper» question. I am sure the public will expect from you a more explicit reply to my letter than you have yet given. You stated your conviction that the manuscript containing Hieratic and Greek writing had been tampered with, and the bulk of the former character removed by blotting-paper. My reply was, that the appearance which you fancied you saw could not exist *at all* as a result of the application of that substance; and, secondly, that the position of the portions of blotting-paper which do exist, *above* the Greek text, entirely refute your hypothesis. Some more definite reply than you have yet made is due, I submit, in common fairness, after so grave a charge as that which you have made, against «some person or persons unknown». I am in this instance the defender, not of Simonides, but of the unfortunate Papyrus itself, which, if gifted with the power of thought, would consider it very hard measure to be so lightly accused of bearing false witness after a preservation from countless dangers for some sixteen centuries.

In reference to the last paragraph of your note, which assumes-rather, I think, with the animus of an opponent than with the impartiality of a judge—the probability that Simonides has forged the texts in question, I would suggest an experiment on a tolerably large scale to demonstrate the *possibility,* not only of erasing and re-writing, so as to leave no trace of the operation, but also of writing on the blank backs of Papyri. I suspect that some rather unexpected difficulties will present themselves, which a greater practical knowledge of the nature and original preparation of the substance would have foreshadowed.

John Eliot Hodgkin

Simonides repeats this letter in the Prolegomena to his edition of the *Periplus* of Hannon and he continues the story as follows:

The only reply Mr. Goodwin could make to this convincing letter was the following:

«When I see the Papyrus again, I may be able to say something on the «blotting-paper» question. My «animus» is simply to point out, if possible, the means of detecting a forgery, concerning which I myself have not the smallest doubt.

C.W.G »

But at the Meeting of the R.S.L. this gentleman had no fresh evidence or arguments to bring forward; indeed, he said he could not see the blotting-paper at all; and on Mr. Deane's pointing out that the pieces were in the position indicated by Mr. Hodgkin, the subject dropped; the following remarks having been made on the Mayer MSS. in general:

The meeting decided to take the discussion on the report forthwith, which was then opened by Mr. Hodgkin, who said that he had examined the manuscripts with very great care, and, as far as the natural senses could be depended upon, he could find nothing in their actual state which should impugn their genuineness. He had been asked by Mr. Vaux if Mr. Mayer could trace the identity of these manuscripts, and since then he had seen the Curator of Mr. Mayer's Museum, who saw and assisted at the unrolling of the manuscripts, which, he added, it was important to state had not been removed from Mr. Mayer's Museum until after the meeting of Mr. Mayer's friends there, on 1st May, 1860, when the passages which were now subjected to dispute had already been brought under public attention. He stated, further, that the Curator could identify, by their form and appearance, the portion of St. Matthew, and the letter of Hermippos, the «Periplus» of Hannon, and the «Dynasties of Carthage», as belonging to the series unrolled by Dr. Simonides and himself in the Mayer Museum, although he could not read the writing. The large letter the Curator remembered distinctly as belonging to Mr. Stobart's collection. As to Mr. Goodwin's assertion about the adherence of some minute portions of blotting-paper, it would have been important if the fragmentary matter had been under the writing; but as that was not the case, the imputation of Mr. Goodwin had evidently no value whatever. While the manuscripts were under exhibition in the Society's rooms, he had asked for a microscope, but no instrument having been furnished there, they had since been submitted to such an examination by the very eminent microscopist, Mr. Deane. Mr. Thomas Wright confirmed Mr. Hodgkin's statement of the publication of the Papyri before Mr. Mayer's soiree, which took place before the Papyri had left Mr. Mayer's possesion.

Mr. Yates said he had examined the «Hannon» and the «Uranios» most minuterly, and could detect no flaw that could militate against the genuiness of the writing. He also had seen Mr. Mayer's Curator; and he explained to the meeting in detail the manner and method of unrolling the

Papyri in Mr. Mayer's Museum. Dr. Simonides unrolled, and the Curator pasted down the pieces on calico. The Curator had recognised the identity of the Gospel of St. John. The great importance of the assumed readings of these manuscripts was such that no doubt it was right closely to scrutinise them; but other important inscriptions had been found in unlikely places besides these. For himself, he could say that he had called on Dr. Simonides at his residence, and no man in his conduct could be, to all appearance, more sincere or more honest. It had been urged against Simonides that he only brought inferior documents for sale in this country; but it was that gentleman's intention, naturally enough, to present his finest manuscripts to the University of Athens. Mr. Deane, whose examination had been somewhat chemical, as well as microscopical, pointed out an important fact in respect to the appearance of one writing over another. When the manuscripts were submitted to him, casting his eye over some «crossed» letters lying on his table, he perceived that at the junction of the two writings there was a tendency of the fluid used in the upper one to run out into the line of the lower writing; and by experiments he found that this took place, through the chemical affinity of the writing-fluid, irrespective of whether the paper was dry or damp. This fact had a strong bearing on the question of the genuineness of the «Uranios», for his examination showed at least that the whole of the under, or uncial, writing must have been written *before* the dark, or ecclesiastical, writing was written *over* it; and which inference was confirmed by the fact that the fine cracks in the superior or dark writing had not been filled up with any writing fluid, as would have been the case if the pale writing had been carried over them. He had used a binocular microscope, and he was satisfied also by this means that the pale writing ran *under* the dark writing; and, lastly, this could be proved by mechanical means—such as scraping off the upper or dark writing with a penknife. If, therefore, the «Uranios» was a forgery, the uncial writing was forged first, and before the ecclesiastical writing was put over it. His assistant had also examined this work, and had come to the same conclusions. He had also gone over the Hieratic Papyrus. At one end a portion had been washed away, by accident. He was informed this was admitted to be genuine. He wished, therefore, to see what appearance this part exhibited. He had also washed and examined some fragments of Papyri given him by Mr. Hodgkin, but he could detect nothing in the Mayer Papyri that had been said there was a number of minute white spots, which had been supposed to be fungi. He had looked at them with a lens, and, if they were fungi, they were *above* the letters. They may be chemical compounds, or chalky matter; and inorganic materials will travel, it was well known, a long way in damp substances. These specks must, however, tend towards the genuiness of the document, at least as far as Simonides is concerned, because if he had put any writing on the Papyri, he must have obliterated the spots». +

+ Vide *The London Review*, February 14th, 1863.

Hodgkin attended the February meeting of the society and reported on it in a letter to *The Guardian* 18th February 1863.

> I attended both the meeting of the Royal Society of Literature for the purpose of attempting to procure for the Uranius and the Papyri the close examination which I believe them to deserve, *and not for that of vindicating the character of Simonides or his claim to the writing of the Codex Sinaiticus,* and it was not likely, therefore, on these grounds alone, that I should respond to Mr. Wright's mandate for the production of the letters in question. I had, however, before the meeting, taken the course which occurred to me as the best for the ascertaining of what seemed to me the most important fact (for reasons furnished by a close scrutiny of the series)-viz., whether all the letters were in the same handwriting; and by the kindness of Mr. Pearson Hill had been referred to the expert employed by the Post-office for investigations of this nature. I found from an interview with him that there was in his opinion no palpable appearance of fraud, and that all the letters were in the same hand.

5. OTHER FORGERIES

In addition to the alleged forgeries in Tregelles' list we learn from discussions about Simonides and Sinaiticus that these were not the only manuscripts which Simonides produced and which created suspicion.

a) In reviewing *The Facsimiles* in July 1863 *The Christian Remembrancer* draws our attention to some of these earlier forgeries:

> About seven years ago, Dr. Constantine Simonides, a native of the Greek island of Syme, the editor of the papyri whose value we are about to discuss, and (by his own account) the actual scribe of the celebrated Codex Sinaiticus itself, was pleased to visit the Bodleian, and laid before the eminent scholar, since placed at the head of that great library, certain Greek manuscripts which he seemed willing to sell. After exhibiting two or three not at all remarkable for age or character, and assenting to the judgment of the Librarian as he referred them severally to the eleventh century, or later, M. Simonides proceeded to unroll, with a great show of care and anxiety, some fragments of vellum, redolent of high antiquity, and covered with uncial writing of the most venerable form and appearance. The cautious Oxonian narrowly inspected the crumbling leaves, and quietly handed them back to their owner, with the simple comment, that these, he thought, might date from about the middle of the *nineteenth* century. The stranger withdrew forthwith with his unsold treasures, and made the best of his way to the railway station. Some of his manuscripts passed into the possession of collectors more fortunate or less wary then Bodley's librarian; and we have been privileged to examine them with much interest and curiosity. As mere specimens of calligraphy, they are worth any moderate sum they may have

cost. We have Anacreon in a nut-shell, portions of Hesiod written βουστροφηδὸν like the famous Sigeian inscription, and seven most primitive-looking leaves, containing the gnomonic poem attributed to Phocylides of Miletus (respecting which we may have more to say presently), whose faded uncial letters have been skilfully revived by some chemical preparation.

b) With reference to Sir Frederick Madden, Keeper of Manuscripts in the British Museum, *The Christian Remembrancer* (July 1863) recalls that he bought some manuscripts from Simonides but was reluctant to catalogue them:

> Sir F. Madden, too, was reasonably suspected of defrauding our longing eyes of other literary relics, purchased from the self-same M. Simonides, by obstinately refusing to insert them in the Museum Catalogue[48]:

In a letter addressed to S. Leigh Sotheby, from the British Museum, Sir Frederic Madden had explained his position in 1856:

> Dear Sir,
>
> You probably remember my speaking to you on the subject of the presumed forgeries of the Greek named Simonides, several months previous to his recent attempt to impose on the Members of the Academy at Berlin. You then expressed great interest in the subject; and, in compliance with your wish, I now willingly furnish you with an account of my own dealings with this personage, who has lately obtained so much notoriety.
>
> As long ago as November 1853, there appeared in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* a long and curious letter from Dr. Mordtmann (Consul from the Hanse Towns at Constantinople), giving a narrative of the extraordinary proceedings of Simonides at Athens and Constantinople, previous to his arrival in England, and the repeated detection and exposure of his fraudulent attempts to imitate ancient Greek manuscripts, and produce them as genuine relics of antiquity. An abstract of this narrative appeared in the *Athenaeum* of February last, which excited much attention, not only from the interest always taken in literary forgeries (particularly if successful), but also from the assertion made, that when Simonides was in England, in spite of the repeated warnings addressed to all «public libraries», he had succeeded in disposing of «many of his manuscripts». The writer thinks it almost incredible that «such impudent frauds could have been successful;» yet, after this opinion, he proceeds to say, «The *British Museum* is said to possess thirty manuscripts of Simonides. These may possibly be genuine, yet they would require a new and careful examination». Of course, this hint was sufficient for many «good-natured» persons to assert, at once, that

48. The keepers of the MSS. at the British Museum are rebuked for this wilfulness by Simonides and reminded that «that day will come when the public, their only master, will call them to account for their ill-advisedness and we shall hear how they will endeavour to justify their wholly unjustifiable proceedings. For the public appointed then to be the... custodians of its wealth, and not to be its masters». (Facsimiles p. 34).

upwards of thirty *forged* Greek MSS. had been purchased from Simonides for the Museum; and this rumour acquired additional strength from a paragraph in the *Athenaeum* of the 1st March last (copied into the *Guardian* and elsewhere), the writer of which positively (but falsely) asserts that «the British Museum bought some of the Simonides scrolls;» and then, after shewing that the librarian of the Bodleian had not been deceived, he concludes that «the Oxonians have some little right to be proud of their scholarship and sagacity» on the occasion.

In reply to this partial and (as I think) injurious statement, I have only to give a plain unvarnished narrative of facts, and leave the unprejudiced scholar to draw his own conclusion.

In February 1853 (nine months before the publication of Dr. Mordtmann's letter), I first saw Simonides, who was introduced to me by the late Mr. William Burckhard Barker (Oriental Interpreter at the Foreign Office), for the purpose of disposing of some «ancient Greek manuscripts» in his possession. These MSS. were placed before me; and, from a memorandum written shortly afterwards, I am able to state their contents, as follows:

1. The Poems of Hesiod, written on very narrow thin scrolls of vellum, in capital letters, and in the *boustrophedon* manner, *i.e.*, alternately from left to right and from right to left.

2. Portions of Homer, on a similar scroll, written in characters so small as not to be read except through a magnifying glass.

3. A treatise of Aristeas, on several small thin vellum scrolls, written also in extremely minute characters, and dated A.M. 6404 = A.C. 896. On my expressing my doubts that any person would be able to decipher this work, Simonides instantly produced a fair transcript of it, on paper, *made by himself;* and I at once became convinced that the transcriber was also the writer of the pretended original.

4. Some vellum leaves, of a quarto size, containing a work in the Persepolitan arrow-headed character, accompanied by an interlineary interpretation in Phoenician; At the end was an inscription in Greek capital letters, stating the contents to consist of the Chronicles of the Babylonians, copied from the library at Alexandria.

5. A small scroll, on vellum, on which were written several lines of Egyptian hieroglyphics, with an interpretation in Greek.

6. Three rolls, of larger size and stouter vellum, in a larger character, purporting to be Imperial Rescripts of the Emperors Romanus and Theodorus *(sic),* signed with cinnabar and gold, and with a miniature at the head of each.

The whole of the above, after a brief but very careful (and, to myself, quite conclusive) examination, I unhesitatingly rejected as modern forgeries. Indeed, the palpable fraud displayed on some of them did not require any extraordinary exertion of «scholarship» or «sagacity» to be at

once detected. As Simonides spoke no language but the Romaic, and in a very quick and voluble manner, Mr. Barker acted throughout as the interpreter; and on his informing the Greek that I did not think the manuscripts were genuine, his features exhibited no change whatever, nor did he attempt any sort of explanation. This impassive or astute character of the man was put to a stronger trial; for, before he left me, he applied for a ticket of admission to the Reading Room, and on my asking Mr. Barker if he would give the usual recommendation required on such an occasion, he at once refused, adding, in plain English, that he believed Simonides «to be a great scoundrel». This was uttered to his face, without causing the slightest emotion on the part of the Greek; yet I had subsequently reason to believe that Simonides knew sufficient English to understand what was said! Having returned the «scrolls» to him, I then inquired if he had any other Greek manuscripts in *volumes,* similar to a fine Greek Psalter of the eleventh century, which chanced to lie on my table. He replied in the affirmative; and on the following day he again (accompanied by Mr. Barker) called on me, with several *genuine* Greek biblical and other manuscripts, on vellum, but mostly imperfect. They consisted of-

1. The Four Gospels, wanting the commencement of Matthew, of the XIIIth century; 4to.

2. The Epistles of Paul, James and Peter, imperfect, XIIIth century; 4to.

3. The Gospel of John, very neatly written, XIIIth century; 12mo.

4. A Homily of Johannes Damascenus, with the Chronographia of Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople, together in a volume, XIth century; 4to.

5. A Geographical Treatise, compiled from Strabo, Arrian, Ptolemy, and others, with three rude Maps, of the XVth century; large 4to.

6. Four leaves, fragments of the Epistle of James, with a Commentary, and of a Lectionary, XIIIth century; 4to.

7. The Commentary of Theophylact, Archbishop of Bulgaria, on the Gospels, XIVth century; fol.

The sum agreed to be given for the above was £46; and they were purchased accordingly, on my recommendation, on the 12th of March, 1853.

These MSS. are now numbered from 19,386 to 19,392 inclusive, among the Additional Manuscripts, and can be seen by all who feel any curiosity respecting them, or are capable of giving an opinion as to their genuineness.

Some months after this transaction Simonides left London, and subsequently proceeded to Oxford, and called at the Bodleian Library; when, in consequence of his doing so, one of the librarians (both of whom, I am happy to say, I regard as personal friends of many years standing), wrote to me, to make inquiries about the Greek, as he had promised «to repeat his visit». At that time, I have every reason to believe, Simonides had not offered any

of his «scrolls» to the Bodleian Library; and in my reply I gave so undisguised an opinion of their character, that, on the next visit of Simonides to Oxford, the librarian was quite *prepared* to receive him, and fore-warned of the suspicious nature of the manuscripts he might produce. It is needless to add, he did not succeed in selling his forgeries to the Universiry. Two months after this (in December) I received a note from Mr. Macray (of Sir Robert Taylor's Institution at Oxford), calling my attention to Dr. Mordtmann's letter, and expressing a hope that his statement, as to some of Simonides' forgeries having been purchased for the Museum was incorrect. I replied, of course, denying the assertion; and shortly afterwards a brief notice was inserted by Mr. Macray in the *Oxford Journal,* alluding to the fraudulent practises of Simonides, but adding that he had been unsuccessful in his attempts, both at the British Museum and at the Bodleian library. Here ended my dealings with this crafty Greek, and I never saw him but once subsequently, and then only for a few minutes, when, in 1854, he called on me to offer for sale a paper MS. of the sixteenth century, containing Greek Homilies, but which I declined to purchase.

I remain, dear Sir, yours very truly,

F. Madden.

This letter appears in *S.L. Sotheby, Principia Typographica* Vol. II Germany (London 1857) 136 c-e.

c) *The Memoir* refers to other manuscripts in order to justify Simonides against accusations made on this occasion by the Bodleian library:

It may here be proper to give an account of an event that occurred during the first visit of Simonides to this country in the year 1854, and which has been the means of prejudicing many persons against him. Mr. Cox, the Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian Library at Oxford, publicly stated that Simonides had called on him at the Library and had offered him manuscripts for sale that were undoubtedly forgeries. Such a report as this, coming from a gentleman in the position of Mr. Cox, was naturally calculated to be most injurious to Simonides; but when the matter is investigated dispassionately it will leave a very different impression to that conveyed by the reports circulated by Mr. Cox.

d) Manuscripts of Hesiod some of which are said to be capable of being interpreted only by Simonides are also referred to in *The Memoir* p. 46f:

Another MS. in the possession of Sir Thomas Phillipps, purchased from Simonides, is that of Hesiod, consisting of ten pieces of parchment, and containing, in addition to the three known writings of Hesiod, four others hitherto unknown, and bearing the following titles «Heosphorus», «Eros», «Horai», and «Aurai». They are written in ancient stenographic characters, a knowledge of the meaning of which is confined exclusively to Simonides, he having learnt the secret of this ancient stenography from another Greek manuscript, which, besides the stenographic letters, contains

also an interpretation of their meaning. It is to be hoped that these unknown works of Hesiod may in due time be deciphered by Simonides, if Sir T. Phillipps should agree to it, that they may be published.

These like the other manuscripts referred to in *The Biographical Memoir* are only mentioned because doubts had been expressed about their authenticity.

e) *The Athenaeum*, as early as 16th February 1856 gives some details of Simonides' earlier forgeries:

The following facts concerning Simonides are taken from a literary Hue-and-Cry published in 1853. They rest on the authority of Dr. Mordtmann, *Charge-d'-Affaires* of the Hanseatic Towns at Constantinople:

Simonides comes from the island of Syme, opposite to Caria, and may be at present (1853) about thirty-five. He has paid great attention to palaeographical studies, and has himself attained an almost incredible mastership in this subject. Several years ago he suddenly appeared at Athens, and offered a mass of the rarest MSS. of lost works, and some very important MSS. of the Classics, all very ancient. He said his uncle had discovered them in a monastery on Mount Athos; he had carried them away secretly, and there were still more left behind. He was very mysterious, and spoke always of his enemies and spies. The Greek Government appointed a Commission to examine his MSS. He produced a very ancient Homer, with the complete Commentary of Eustathius. The Commission reported favourably: there was only one dissentient voice. A new inquiry was made, and the MS. turned out to be a most accurate copy of Wolf's edition of Homer, with all its errata. Simonides was unmasked; but he had in the mean time published his «Symais», a history of the School of Syme, a forgery from beginning to end.

In the year 1851, Simonides made his appearance at Constantinople. He was received by Baron Tecco, the Sardinian Minister. His promises were grand. He was going to publish a Sanchoniathon, which he said he possessed complete. Now Sanchoniathon was rather an ominous name; and Wagenfeld's successful forgery had not yet been forgotten. Therefore Simonides soon dropped Sanchoniathon, and came out instead with a Greek work on Hieroglyphics. He maintained that his work gave, among the rest, a translation of an inscription on an Egyptian figure, which belonged to a M. Cayol at Constantinople. A meeting was held, at which Baron Tecco and Dr. Mordtmann assisted. Simonides read his translation; and it was found that it did not square with the original at all. This having failed, Simonides promised to produce a MS. containing Cuneform Inscriptions, with a transcript in Phoenician letters. As Dr. Mordtmann, however, was well acquainted with both of these alphabets, Simonides never produced this treasure at Constantinople. It is a curious fact, that an old parchment, pretending to come from the Library of Seleucus, was some years ago communicated to the Royal Asiatic Society in London. It contained Cuneiform

Babylonian Inscriptions, with a transcript in Phoenician letters; and it is stated by one of the most competent scholars, who took a copy of some lines of the MS., that the transcript into Phoenician was correct; and that, at the time, Col. (now Sir Henry) Rawlinson had not yet deciphered, or at least not yet published, any of his readings of the Babylonian Inscriptions.

Simonides, having the scrutinizing eye of Dr. Mordtmann upon him, abandoned Sanchoniathon, the Hieroglyphics, and Cuneiform Inscriptions; but produced instead a Greek work giving a complete history of Armenia. The Armenians at Constantinople, being men of literary taste, offered to buy his MS., and to publish it with an Armenian translation. He gave them some specimens of his work; but the proper names which occurred in it were not Armenian at all. Pressed to produce the rest, he hesitated, and at last demanded one million of piastres before he would part with his treasure. This put an end to the history of Armenia.

But Simonides was not yet discouraged. He soon came before the public with a more startling discovery than any he had yet made. He said he possessed a MS. of the time of the Franco-Venetian rule of Constantinople. In this MS. a monk, he said, gave an account of many valuable MSS. buried by the Comneni, in order to hide them from the Latins. The places where they were buried were accurately defined along the Bosphorus; and he was ready to disinter a MS. in a Monastery of the Prince Islands, containing the Acts of the first Apostolic Council of Antioch. Simonides asked leave to dig from the Turkish Government, and from the Patriarch, Anthimos; and when this was refused, he spread a story that, like the Chalif Omar, the Patriarch had said to him: «The Acts of the Council of Antioch are superfluous; they either confirm or contradict the Canons of the Greek Church, and in either case it will be useless to dig».

Soon after, Simonides paid a visit to Ismail Pasha, the Turkish Minister of Public Works and Commerce, by birth a Greek. He lived at his villa in Bebek, on the Bosphorus; and as he had not yet left his harem when his guest arrived, Simonides walked alone in the garden. He afterwards declared, that, in the garden, he had discovered one of the places marked in his work as a place where MSS. had been buried; and that, if he was allowed to dig, he would produce a poem of Aristotle in Greek, written in Carian characters. Excavations were made; a box was discovered, and it contained the MS. in a tolerable state of preservation. M. Cayol was present, and published an account of what he had seen in the Journal of Constantinople; but the name of Simonides was sufficient to damp the enthusiasm of the literary world.

A last appeal was made. Ibrahim Pasha, one of the most learned men at Constantinople, was building a house near the Hippodrome (Atmeidan). Excavations were going on; and Simonides, on being asked by M. Cayol, declared that an Arabian MS., written in Syriac characters, would be found

on a certain spot. The workmen dug for two hours, Ibrahim Pasha and M. Cayol being present, and Simonides not being allowed to descend. At last a pause was made, and the gentlemen partook of a luncheon. After luncheon the digging was resumed, and almost immediately Simonides was heard to exclaim, «There it is! bring it up». A box was brought; but the soil which adhered to it was of a different kind from that of the ground. The workmen were grinning: and when interrogated, confessed that, during luncheon, the Greek came out for a short time, jumped into the pit, and began to burrow.

This put an end to Simonides' career in the East. He left Constantinople, and came to England; and, in spite of the repeated warnings addressed to all Public Libraries, he succeeded in disposing of many of his MSS. Among the most curious MSS. which he left in England, one is a copy of Hesiod, written βουστροφηδόν,another, the identical copy of some books of Homer, sent from Chios to Hipparchus, the son of Pisistratus. It is almost incredible that such impudent frauds could have been successful;but there is little doubt that many more will now be brought to light. The British Museum is said to possess thirty MSS. of Simonides. These may possibly be genuine; yet they would require a new and careful examination.

At Leipzig, Simonides sold a copy of Hermas the Shepherd, a Christian work of the first century, hitherto known only in a Latin translation. It was published by Prof. Dindorf and Prof. Anger; and is no doubt a forgery[49]

In view of this background it is particularly interesting that, in the case of Sinaiticus, Simonides is claiming that for once he *is* the author. The real reason for this is of course that because most of the manuscripts Simonides had produced in recent years had been rejected as forgeries he wished to impute Tischendorf with the same accusation. This motive will be clearer when we investigate Simonides' previous contacts with Germany in general and Tischendorf in particular.

APPENDIX

Undeterred by the publicity surrounding Sinaiticus, Simonides published in 1864 his *Periplus* of Hannon and *Horus* (London: Trübner) in which he lists his published works as follows: (Note especially No. 40 and 41).

Κατάλογος τῶν ἐκδεδομένων συγγραμμάτων Κ. Σιμωνίδου διδάκτορος τῆς Φιλοσοφίας.

1. **Ἀρχαιολογικὴ Ἱστορία τῆς Καρικῆς Χερρονήσου, καὶ κυρίως τῆς πόλεως ΚΝΙΔΟΥ.** Ἐξεδόθη ἐν Μόσχᾳ τῷ 1842 ἔτει.
2. **Χημικὰ Ἀθωϊτῶν.** Ἐν Ὀδησσῷ τῷ 1843.
3. **Ὑπόμνημα Ἱστορικὸν τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς Ἁγιογραφίας καὶ τῆς τῶν Ἀθωϊτῶν ἁγιογράφων,** Ἐν Ὀδησσῷ τῷ 1843.

49. This letter is repeated in S.L. Sotheby Principia Typographica IV (London, 1857).

4. **Περίληψις Ἱστορικῆ τῶν ἐν Ἄθωνι ἱερῶν μονῶν.** Ἐν Ὀδησσῷ, τῷ 1842.
5. **Ἀρχαιολογικὰ Ὑπομνήματα.** Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, τῷ 1843.
6. **Περὶ Λυκιακῶν καὶ Καρικῶν γραμμάτων βιβλία δύω.** Ἐν Σμύρνῃ, τῷ 1843.
7. **Ἡ Ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ Ἀποστολικοῦ πατρὸς Βαρνάβα.** Ἐν Σμύρνῃ, τῷ 1843.
8. **Μάχαιρα, ἢ κατὰ τῆς Δυναστείας τοῦ Ὄθωνος.** Ἀθήνησι, τῷ 1848.
9. **Ἡ Ὀρθόδοξος φωνή.** Ἀθήνησι, τῷ 1848.
10. **Συμαῖς, ἢ Ἱστορία τῆς ἐν Σύμῃ Ἀπολλωνιάδος Σχολῆς.** Ἀθήνησι, τῷ 1849.
11. **Γεωγραφικά τε καὶ Νομικὰ τὴν Κεφαλληνίαν ἀφορῶντα.** Ἀθήνησι, τῷ 1849.
12. **Ὑπόμνημα περὶ τῶν Ἱερῶν Γραφῶν.** Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, τῷ 1850.
13. **Κατὰ Παπιστῶν καὶ Καλβίνων.** Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, τῷ 1850.
14. **Κατάλογος τῆς τοῦ Σιναίου ὄρους Βιβλιοθήκης, καὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Σάββα, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Βασιλόπαιδος Παύλου.** Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, τῷ 1850.
15. **Ὁ Βυζαντινὸς Ὀβελίσκος.** Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, τῷ 1851.
16. **Ὑπόμνημα πρὸς τοὺς πατριάρχας Κωνστάντιον καὶ Ἄνθιμον περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἰδιορρύθμων μονῶν τοῦ Ἄθωνος.** Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, τῷ 1852.
17. **Ἑρμηνεία δακτυλιολίθων τινῶν.** Ἐν Σμύρνῃ, τῷ 1852.
18. **Κατὰ Στεφάνου Κουμανούδου.** Ἐν Ὀδησσῷ, τῷ 1853.
19. **Ἑρμηνεία τῶν Ζωγράφων ὡς πρὸς τὴν Ἐκκλησιαστικὴν Ζωγραφίαν, συγγραφεῖσα μὲν ὑπὸ Διονυσίου Ἱερομονάχου καὶ Ζωγράφου τοῦ ἐκ Φουρνᾶ τῶν Ἀγράφων, Ἐκδοθεῖσα δὲ ὑπὸ Σιμωνίδου δαπάνῃ τῶν τυπογράφων φ. Καραμπίνου καὶ Βάφα.** Ἀθήνησι, τῷ 1853.
20. **Ἦθη καὶ Ἔθιμα τῶν ἀρχαίων Αἰγυπτίων.** Ἐν Μόσχᾳ, τῷ 1853.
21. **Σπουδαῖον ὑπόμνημα περὶ τῶν ἓξ καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα ἀπογράφων τοῦ Ἀποστολικοῦ πατρὸς Ἑρμᾶ.** Ἐν Μόσχᾳ, τῷ 1853.
22. **Μεταγραφαὶ αὐτόγραφοι.** Ἐν Μόσχᾳ, τῷ 1853.
23. **Ἐγκώμιον Κωνσταντίνου Ἀκροπολίτου εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Κωνσταντῖνον.** Ἐν Λονδίνῳ, τῷ 1853.
24. **Σύμμιγα.** Ἐν Μόσχᾳ, τῷ 1853, καὶ Ὀδησσῷ τῷ 1854.
25. **Λυκιακά.** Ἐν Ὀδησσῷ τῷ 1854.
26. **Αὐτόγραφα.** Ἐξεδόθησαν δίς, ἔν τε Μόσχᾳ, τῷ 1853, καὶ Ὀδησσῷ, τῷ 1854.
27. **Συλλογὴ ἀνεκδότων Ἑλληνικῶν παπύρων.** Ἐν Ὀδησσῷ, τῷ 1854.
28. **Ἑλληνικὰ κεράμια.** Ἐν Μόσχᾳ, τῷ 1854.
29. **Σπουδαιοδρόμιον.** Τύποις Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, τῷ 1854.
30. **Ὁ Ἀναιδὴς λογοκλόπος.** Τύποις Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, τῷ 1854.

31. **Ἐπιγραφικὸν μνημεῖον.** Ἀθήνῃσι, τῷ 1855.
32. **Περὶ τῆς γνησιότητος τοῦ Οὐρανίου διατριβὴ πρώτη, γερμανιστί.** Ἐν Μονάχῳ, τῷ 1856.
33. **Νικολάου τοῦ Μακαριωτάτου Ἐπισκόπου Μεθώνης Συλλογισμὸς περὶ τοῦ Παναγίου πνεύματος.** Ἐν Μονάχῳ, τῷ 1857.
34. **Μέμνων σύγγραμμα ἀρχαιολογικόν.** Ἐν Μονάχῳ, τῷ 1857.
35. **Ὀρθοδόξων Ἑλλήνων Θεολογικαὶ Γραφαὶ τέσσαρες.** Ἐν Λονδίνῳ, τῷ 1858.
36. **Ἐπιστολιμαία περὶ Ἱερογλύφων διατριβή.** Ἐν Λονδίνῳ, τῷ 1860.
37. **Μαϋέρειος Κώδηξ.** Ἐν Λονδίνῳ, τῷ 1861.
38. **Γεωργίου Σχολαρίου ἔκθεσις περὶ τοῦ Γένους τῶν Μελισσηνῶν.** Ἐν Λονδίνῳ, τῷ 1862 ἔτει.
39. **Περὶ Ὅρου τοῦ Νειλοπολίτου καὶ τῶν συγγραμμάτων αὐτοῦ.** Ἐν Λονδίνῳ, τῷ 1863 ἔτει.
40. **Codex Friderico-Augustanus et.** Ἐγγράφη μὲν ὑπὸ **Κ. Σιμωνίδου,** ἐν Ἄθωνι τῷ 1839, ἐξεδόθη δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Καθηγητοῦ **Τισσενδορφίου** τῷ 1846 Ἐν Λιψείᾳ.
41. **Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus-Petropolitanus.** Ἐγράφη μὲν καὶ τοῦτο ἐν Ἄθωνι τῷ ὄρει ὑπὸ **Σιμωνίδου,** ἐξεδόθη δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ καθηγητοῦ **Τισσενδορφίου,** ὡς ἀρχαῖον δῆθεν, ἐν Λιψείᾳ τῷ 1863, δαπάνῃ τοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος πασῶν τῶν Ρωσσιῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ δευτέρου.
42. **Ἄννωνος Περίπλους,** κ.τ.λ. Ἐν Λονδίνῳ, τῷ 1864.

V. THE BIOGRAPHICAL MEMOIR

Throughout this monograph we have shown how Simonides' guilt and deception were exposed. We must now seek a motive for his behaviour.

It has already been made clear that his personality was such that he made many enemies. Among those whom he places in this category are the priest Nicolaides with whom he lodged in Liverpool, «the enemies in the British Museum» (letter to *The Guardian* 16th March, 1863), Mr. W.A. Wright (who in this same letter is threatened with legal proceedings), Tregelles (against whom Simonides rails and whose expostulations are censored by *The Guardian,* 11th March, 1863). These we have already noted[50]. In addition the suggestion was made in the Official Gazette of Athens of 1861 that Simonides had been excommunicated. Certainly some of the monks of Athos were antagonistic towards Simonides according to Hodgkin's report in the *Literary Churchman* 1st December, 1863. The main enemy made by Simonides was of course Tischendorf and other German scholars.

One of the reasons why Stewart's *Biographical Memoir* was published was to answer some of the enemies Simonides had accumulated. This *Memoir* to which we have referred earlier was published in 1859 to vindicate Simonides against claims of forgery. This was of course earlier than the Sinaiticus affair. It was however not the only biography of Simonides as he himself tells us in a letter to *The Guardian* of 21st January, 1863:

> Some of these also undertook to write my history during my lifetime-first, Professor Tischendorf; secondly, a certain Lycourgos, for a long time a spy of Tischendorf, living upon me; thirdly, a certain German, who had become a mercenary slave of Tischendorf; and fourthly, Mr. Charles Stewart, who undertook his work for truth's sake, but said nought to me of it until it had been sent to press, and the greater part already printed; thus even he committed not a few errors, for which I hold myself in no degree responsible, any more than for those of the other writers, some of whom (deriving their inspiration from sources unknown to me) state that I was born on Mount Athos, whereas at Athos no women are to be found, neither is a woman allowed, under any pretence, to visit Mount Athos, because this place was consecrated of old by the monks for retirement. Others say that I am Archbishop of the Island of Rhodes; some set me down as eighty-seven years of age, married, and the father of twenty-four children, four feet high, having hands of extraordinary length. Some again say that I am from Trebizond, Byzantium, Cappadocia, Odessa, Patara, Acanthus, Rhodes, and have a countenance very beautiful, and like the

50. See pp. 47, 102.

fabulus Narcissus. Some write that I am a native of Abyssinia, because I have a very dark complexion. Each wrote and said what he pleased. It is not needful to answer such ridiculous stories, seeing that both friends and foes testify unanimously to their being absurd and unfounded.

My having presented to some of my friends copies of Mr. Charles Stewart's biography of myself is no evidence of its correctness, as Mr. W.A. Wright asserts[51], for I bought with my own money fifty copies of the trifles written against me be Lycourgos, inspired by Tischendorf, and other pamphlets written against me by his art, and distributed them to my friends and enemies. I have acted similarly now, having taken ten copies of *The Guardian* of the 5th of November, containing the letter concerning the pseudo-Sinaitic Codex, and having presented them to my friends: wherefore if you suppose this to be a confirmation of your letter, I say to you, withdraw from the society of men, for you do not possess a sound judgment. And now know, zealous defender of the pseudo-Sinaitic Codex, that I will not give an answer to what any one may write for or against me, but I will defend whatever I have written or shall write in Greek, Carian, Lycian, Persian, &c., because these are the only languages unfortunately which I understand, not knowing any of the modern tongues accurately.

We have already seen why Simonides had to deny the correctness of some of the statements in the *Memoir* in the light of criticisms made since 1862, but that does not deny the value of the *Memoir* as a whole. In England this is the only biography of significance in the story of Codex Sinaiticus and Simonides.

We will look at this *Memoir* in some detail as it gives valuable insight into the background of Simonides and the sort of problems he caused prior to the discovery of Sinaiticus. We can also detect in this possible reasons for Simonides' hostility to Tischendorf and his successes.

The *Memoir* begins in a very eulogistic way in the Preface:

The sole object of the following pages is to vindicate the reputation of a friend, most unjustly assailed by calumny. Simonides arrived in England in 1853, bringing with him letters of introduction from the most eminent men in the East. He at once became intimate with various members of the writer's family, and the intimacy in time ripened into a sincere friendship. Simonides has on all occasions borne out the character assigned to him in his letters of introduction-that of being a gentleman of the most unblemished honour, and those who know him best need no other assurance than his own honourable conduct to convince them of the baseless nature of the charges that have been preferred against him. It is, however, not surprising that such charges should have been made. Simonides is but very slightly acquainted with modern languages, and his knowledge of modern customs is even still more limited. With the habits, manners, and languages of the in-

51. e.g. in the letter on p. 40.

habitants of the earth two, three, or four thousand years ago, he is perfectly familiar; but of the wordly wisdom of the present day, or of the ideas of modern society, his knowledge does not reach above a simplicity that is absolutely childlike. Moreover, in common with all Orientals, he possesses a natural secretiveness that is quite opposed to the frankness of an Englishman, and without any motive whatever keeps secret matters that most persons would never think of concealing. Thus, although he has more than once had such epithets as «adventurer» applied to him, and labours under all the disadvantages that in this country accompany a man whose antecedents are unknown and whose life appears to be a mystery, he has never once replied to his adversaries of communicated the smallest particulars of his birth, family, education, or means. It is, therefore, not surprising that statements, made in unusal manner, and documents produced under extraordinary circumstances, should have been doubted and their authenticity disputed by some portion of the public and the press. On the contrary, it is rather a cause for surprise hat such large credence has been given to him by men whose pursuits have tendency to promote an extreme caution in the reception of that which is new or novel. There is, however, no reason why Simonides should any longer be subjected to the inconveniences and prejudices arising from his apparent position as an «adventurer». The facts related in the present memoir have all come within the knowledge of the writer, and every incident can be corroborated by the most unimpeachable testimony. The publication of this memoir will, it is hoped, free Simonides from the insinuations that have been made against him, and by placing him before the public in his true position as a gentleman of good birth and family, as a man of the strictest integrity, who would scorn to commit a dishonourable action, and as one whose perfect indifference to all pecuniary considerations leaves no motive for the commission of the disgraceful deeds of which he has been suspected and accused, may assist in procuring for him that personal respect and esteem to which the writer, after a close and friendly intercourse, is convinced he is entitled. Should any doubt be entertained as to the veracity of the statements contained in the memoir, the writer will feel a pleasure in replying to any enquiry and in furnishing the authority on which the statement is made.

The tone of this alone is suspicious, and the independence of the *Memoir* is doubted even by the *Literary Churchman* in the review on the 16th February, 1863:

> There are certain points in his Biography which, to us, seem to need much clearing up. The name, too, of Mr. Charles Stewart, on the title-page, is puzzling. Many persons thought, for a time, that it was Mr. Stewart, the well-known foreign publisher; but he knows nothing of it. *Who* is this «Charles Stewart»?

Simonides replies to this on the 16th March, 1863 in the same journal:

> My biographer is Mr. Charles Steuart, who lives at Brighton. His brother, Mr. Henry C. Steuart, lives at 41, Great Percystreet, Islington, W.C. Write, therefore, to him, and he will give thee the reply thou requirest.

This address re-appears in the letter which Simonides supposedly sent to Stewart in 1860 (but which was published only in September 1863)[52].

Although the inference is not drawn it seems obvious from the language of the *Memoir* that Charles Stewart is either a close Greek friend of Simonides who took dictation from him, or else is Simonides himself-C.S. being their common initials. Tregelles comes nearest to offering this explanation (in his letter to *The Guardian* of 11th February, 1863):

> The author of the Memoir of Simonides promises that «if *any doubt* should remain in the mind of the reader, the authority for every statement shall be *at once* furnished» (p. 32). Let, then, the author of the Memoir, Mr. Charles Stewart, or *Scarlatus Stourtzas,* give, according to his promise, *at once,* explanations of all difficulties; in Greek, if he pleases (since he writes by preference, Tissendorf, Montphocon, &.c), or if in English, so definitely that there can be no doubt about the translation.

Scarlatus Stourtzas is mentioned in the *Memoir* as an officer in the service of Emperor Nicolas I and of Emperor Alexander of Russia and the brother of Rhoxandra Etlegg who sponsored Simonides' studies in Russia.

Wright in a letter to *The Guardian,* 28th January 1863, draws attention to the fact that the *Memoir* is in part translated from Greek, and that much of the information (especially regarding Simonides' unpublished theological writings) could only have been known to Simonides himself.

But even if Simonides himself or a very close ally did write the *Memoir,* its importance as a background document to the Sinaiticus affair is not diminished because from it we are enabled to assess Simonides' career and the probable motives leading to his behaviour in 1862-3.

«Stewart» says Constantine Leonides Photeas Simonides was born in Hydra in 1824 on November 11th. His mother was from Syme and his father (living in Rhodes at the time of writing) from Stageira. The story continues in this way:

> Simonides, then, being a native of Hydra, went at the age of four to Aegina, with his parents, where a short time afterwards he and his brother Photius were placed as pupils in the school at Aegina by the direction of Capodistrias, Governor of Greece, on account of the merits of their father, for that great man was extremely well-disposed to all the family of Simonides. So high an opinion had Capodistrias of the elder Simonides that he employed him on many occasions in Government affairs of the gravest importance. It was in consequence of his being despatched by Capodistrias to Constantinople on a political mission of a most difficult character that his family removed to Syme during his absence, the two brothers, Constan-

52. Extracts quoted on p. 55f.

tine and Photius, remaining at School at Aegina. Their stay at that place was, however, brought to a conclusion shortly after by the troubles that followed on the assassination of Capodistrias, and their uncle Michael took them from school and conducted them to their mother Mary in Syme.

Having arrived at their mother's house they studied a short time under Hierotheus Photiades, a learned man, and their uncle on the mother's side. Subsequently Constantine Simonides returned to Aegina, by himself, and first attended the lectures of Philetaerus, the grammarian, and then the learned Neophytus Ducas, Gregory Constantas, and Rhegas, the mathematician, remaining with them till the completion of his studies; those were the most learned of the Greeks at that period. After this he went to Nauplia, with Philetaerus, and thence to Athens. Having pursued his studies for some time in the latter city, and not having received any intelligence of his family, owing to the unsettled condition of the country and other causes, he visited the island of Calauria, expecting to find there his relative Benedict, the uncle of his mother. On arriving at Calauria (now known by the name of Porhros) he was surprised to find that Benedict had left the island, and had gone to Mount Athos. Simonides consequently returned to Piraeus, the port of Athens, and setting sail for Mount Athos, reached that celebrated place in November, 1839, where he found his relative Benedict living in the monastery of Rhosos. In this monastery he remained some time, studying theology under Benedict, who was a most accomplished scholar and a great linguist. Benedict had been a teacher of religion in many parts of Greece, and was so highly esteemed by Capodistrias that he had received at his hands the appointment of Professor of Doctrinal Theology in the School of Calauria.

The deathof Capodistrias had necessitated his removal from that island, and he accordingly took up his residence in Mount Athos, where he collected the monks who had been dispersed in every direction, restored the monastery of Rhosos,-which had been entirely devastated by the Ottomans,-and having brought it back to the condition in which it was before its overthrow, afforded in his own person an example of ascetic life, not only to the brethren of the community, but also to all the fathers in the mountain. Moreover, he expended the whole of his property, by no means inconsiderable, in the restoration of other holy dwellings, which had become almost deserted through lapse of time. Having acquired, by these means, very great influence on Mount Athos, he became the possessor of many highly valuable Greek manuscripts, the greater portion of which he took from the monastery of Esphygmenos, situate in Mount Athos, where first he was deemed worthy of the holy monastic condition.

These manuscripts from being kept in damp cellars had suffered greatly; he therefore put them away in a secret place, known only to himself. Together with these manuscripts, he obtained moreover an ancient library, also preserved in the cellars for a great number of years. This was an ex-

ceedingly rich one, having been collected at royal expense, and it is said that St. Paul brought it from Constantinople and Alexandria, about the year 1172. St. Paul was also the founder of the monasteries of Xeropotamus and St. Paul in Mount Athos, and was the son of the Emperor Nicholas Curopalatus, surnamed Rhancabe, and Procopia, daughter of the Emperor Nicephorus Genicus: the Emperor Leo, the Armenian, made him a eunuch while a mere boy.

The discovery of these manuscripts and library may be considered as one of the most important events in the history of Simonides. It must be remembered that Mount Athos is subject to the Turkish Government, and that the sole law throughout the Ottoman empire is the will of the Sultan and his officials. In England it would appear highly improbable that the discoverer of an ancient library would remove it in secret and keep it concealed from the world in a secure hiding place. But under a Government such as the Turkish, where law is slightly regarded and the property of the conquered people little respected, the proceeding most natural is that of concealment. So uncontrolled is the power of the Turks over their Greek subjects, that life would be in absolute danger if it were known that a Greek had made a discovery of property and had not delivered it up to the nearest officer of the Turkish despotism. Even at the present moment, writing in London, there are many facts of very general public interest that cannot be narrated in this Memoir, owing to a fear of the consequences that might ensue to individuals now living in the Turkish dominions if a knowledge of such matters should be conveyed to the Turkish officials in the neighbourhood. The publication of the facts connected with the discovery of the library and manuscripts already referred to, cannot, however, be injurious to any one, the persons chiefly interested having passed into a kingdom where Czar and Sultan rule no more, and oppressor and oppressed both bow before the throne of mercy. The discovery was made in this wise.

A very old monk, Gregory by name, being nearly at the end of his life, grateful to Benedict for the restoration of the monastery of Rhosos, and recognising in him his superior,—committed to his charge an ancient document in the form of a Will and an Imperial Golden Bull. This Will spoke of a hidden library, and described the place of its concealment. An examination was made and sufficient was discovered to warrant means being taken for a more complete investigation. Under the pretence of erecting a small chapel in memory of the extinct monastery, an excavation in the ruins was carried on unknown to the Government. After much labour the entrance to the secret hiding place was discovered. The library itself lay beneath the old monastery, the inclosure of which was full of ruins of its own walls and of the houses around it which had been thrown down. The entrance to it was found inside the wall on the right of that portion of the monastery known as the catechumens, in the form of a circular window surrounded with

brass, and offering no suspicion of an opening. Being buried by the multitude of stones and the mounds which had fallen between the walls and upon it, it was rendered altogether invisible, rendering it confusing even for those who had excavated the place to discover it. Upon entering into the repository it was found full of manuscripts, for the most part decayed, of which some had been thrown in a heap and lay in confusion in the middle of the library; others were arranged in good order in their places, and others in cases of lead, tin, and other metals. With them were also very ancient pictures, and sacred ornaments, and other decorative articles of the Eastern Church of the Greeks. Simonides, seeing all these things lying in this state, said to Benedict with tears, «Why, oh uncle, is all this confusion!» But he cried, with a groan, «My son, when the Latinisers during the patriarchate of Becos the Latiniser, and those resembled them in barbarity filled this sacred land with blood, disobeyed the Eastern Church, and plundered the possessions of this mountain, the monks of this ruined monastery, as you see, took them and cast them in at hazard, fearing the threatened removal of them by the hands of these persecutors, as had already happened to those of others. And from that time, as it would seem, they have remained buried here, as though they who buried them were through circumstances unable, or did not think fit, to free them from this obscure prison». Thus spoke the old man, weeping and venting his indignation against the Latinisers, and still more against the Crusaders who subdued the mountain. Then, having removed them all carefully into a neighbouring room, with the aid of Simonides, and the cousin-german of Simonides on the mother's side, the holy monk Sabbas, who afterwards became a dignitary of the mountain, he carefully preserved them in his depository, where his other manuscripts were for the most part kept.

Benedict, therefore, having become the possessor of such an inestimable treasure, set aside everything else, and applied himself diligently to the care of it, day and night, alone and without any aid, having in his mind the publication of the manuscripts. Afterwards, however, being compelled to take an assistant, owing to an inflammation of the eyes, he instructed his nephew, Simonides, in the art of palaeography by means of these manuscripts of his own. The reading of them being very difficult it became troublesome and injurious to his sight; for Benedict was an old man of seventy, and the manuscripts were difficult to decipher not only from their antiquity, but from the entire difference in the writing of one from another. Simonides, therefore, being taught by a man of great experience in such matters, and being daily spurred on by emulation, became an assistant worthy of the expectation of Benedict; he was his right hand,—for he acted as his representative in everything,— both in reading and copying the manuscripts. Meanwhile, Benedict having fallen grievously ill, and foreseeing his end approaching, called Simonides and enjoined him to take the greatest possible care of the manuscripts and library. He bound him by a

sacred promise to reveal the place of their concealment to no one, and to part with or dispose of no portion of the collection. He pointed out to Simonides the necessity of his taking them away from Mount Athos and preserving them in a place of security until the troubles of his country ceased and the hand of the oppressor was no longer felt in the land. He was then to restore them to Greece, to benefit his countrymen by their possession. He then gave Simonides his blessing, and departed this life on the 29th of August 1840, to the great lamentation of all his family. Simonides dwelt for three months in Mount Athos after the death of Benedict, and he then procured a private vessel and removed the library and antiquarian collection to Syme.

We may assume that thus far the story is the authorized version according to Simonides-at least in 1859. But it is into this framework that the Sinaiticus story had to be slotted. As we have seen, this caused problems not least regarding his birthdate, in order to accommodate the date of Benedict's death.

The Memoir then goes on to plot Simonides's progress in Constantinople and Odessa where, according to the reports, he was a top flight scholar!

He made, moreover, gigantic progress in his studies, as is witnessed by the testimonials written by the masters who have taught him, being admired for his natural talents, loved and applauded by his fellow students, and pointed out and boasted of among his fellow scholars, on account of his marked superiority[53].

The *Memoir* then goes on to indicate in an oblique way an «unfortunate» episode of a political nature in which Simonides was involved. The extract given below gives some insight into politics in Greece in the mid nineteenth century, but is particularly significant in our story because it gives a reason for the anti-German feeling which probably influenced the campaign against Tischendorf later. This is how Stewart tells the story:

Arriving at Athens on the 12th July, 1846, he (=Simonides) was presented to the ex-minister, John Colettes, and delivered to him a packet of letters of introduction, which he had brought from Odessa, and moreover, several recommendations from persons of note.

Now commences one of the most unfortunate portions of the career of Simonides;—unfortunate, however, only so far as concerns the interests of literature and philosophy,—for his own conduct was especially honourable and partiotic. The capital of Greece of late years has been the centre of innumerable intrigues and endless political plots. Among a large portion of the population the Bavarian king, Otho, is detested, and every true Greek looks forward with eagerness to the day of his country's regeneration. The wildest schemes have existence, and the most sagacious men take part in plots which are as extravagant as they are futile. Thrown among the most

53. Memoir p. 9.

energetic men of Athens, Simonides soon became as active a politician as any in the capital and warmly espoused the party of which John Colettes was the chief member. He contributed many articles to the Athenian papers and denounced the party of Rhancabe as traitors to Greece. M. Jonas, a politician of some eminence in the party of Rhancabe, he attacked with such great vigour and success that he procured his banishment from Greece, though this was accomplished only by the greatest exertions of Simonides, and by efforts in which he fearlessly risked his own life. Simonides, on the other hand, was assailed with extreme virulence, and so far did the animosity of party extend that his personal safety was endangered.

From this scene of civil strife and flagrant treachery he soon retired, and departed into Thessaly. Having gone through the whole of that country he composed his «Thessalian Archaeology» in two books. Next having attentively surveyed the country of Chaldaea, and gone thence to Athos, he returned once more to Athens and wrote the History of Chaldaea. Having been long desirous of carrying out the injunctions and manuscript treasures now made an effort to make his antiquarian and manuscript treasures available for the use of his country, and in December, 1848, took means to secure them for the benefit of the Greek capital. No sooner was it known that Simonides had these valuable books and manuscripts in his possession than those in Athens who were subservient to the Bavarian policy, left no stone unturned, and strove with all their might, to persuade him to transfer all his antiquarian treasures to Munich, in Bavaria, making him many promises if he would do so. But Simonides, paying no attention to the words of such men, treated them all with haughty contempt, especially the Court of Greece itself. Hence he once more incurred the hatred and animosity, not only of the Camarilla, but of all its creatures; and, incredible as it may appear to Englishmen, the knife of the hired assassin was employed to put an end to his career, and to furnish his enemies with an opportunity of obtaining his much-coveted treasures. Several ridiculous reports were at the same time spread abroad concerning him, such, for instance, as that he himself wrote and composed the manuscript library which his uncle bequeathed to him. Considering that the library consists of 5,000 bulky volumes, and that they could not be written by one man in less than a thousand years, this was a tolerably wide stretch of malignity, especially when it is remembered that Simonides was at that time not thirty years of age[54].

To put an end to such nonsense as this Simonides invited the Professors of Greece to a meeting, to inspect his manuscripts and pronounce upon their authenticity and value. The invitation was made through the Minister of Education, M.D. Calliphronas, and resulted in three sittings of the Professors being held at the office of the Minister and in his presence.

54. It is interesting to compare this with what is claimed by Simonides later for his achievements at 19!

Simonides produced several of his manuscripts, and of all the Professors present only one, and he the youngest and the least versed in palaeography, declared against them. Some declared themselves to be undecided, but the majority gave in their opinions as being favourable to the authenticity of the manuscripts. M. Cumanudes, the only gentleman who pronounced against them, afterwards admitted that he had not even taken the manuscripts into his hands, and it was made apparent at the meetings that many of the Professors possessed only a very moderate knowledge of the subject. So remarkable was the ignorance displayed by one or two individuals, that it excited comments of a by no means flattering character, and the individuals themselves, annoyed at these remarks, contracted a dislike towards Simonides that afterwards produced unfavourable results. The remainder of the stay of Simonides in this city was occupied in matters of little importance, and he shortly afterwards went over to Constantinople with M.A. Metaxas, Lieutenant-General, then appointed for the first time as representative of the Greek Court at the Ottoman Porte. Before leaving the subject of the meeting of the Greek Professors, it may be remarked that the manuscripts submitted to them, and which they received with some doubt and uncertainty, were the same that were afterwards purchased by the British Museum and Sir Thomas Phillipps, and have been pronounced genuine after the severest scrutiny and the most minute examination. The Professors, whose vanity was mortified in the way already spoken of, subsequently attacked Simonides in the local journals, and calumniated him in the vilest manner in connection with the very manuscripts that were pronounced by Sir F. Madden to be genuine. Indeed, that gentleman became their purchaser for the Museum[55].

The *Memoir* then continues by showing how Simonides combined politics and academic study in Constantinople, Mount Athos, Asia Minor and Egypt where he is said to be collecting MSS. We are then told he set off for England in 1853 travelling from there to Paris and later to Berlin and Leipzig.

It is when he is at Leipzig that we find our next piece of background information for Simonides' anti-German attitude. We pick up the story when Simonides reaches Leipzig on July 15th 1855.

He soon became intimate with the German professors in that city—Anger, Gersdorf, and Dindorf—and then communicated to them his views, at which they expressed great delight. On the 27th of July, 1855, being in the University library of Leipsic with Professor Anger and M. Lycurgus, who interpreted between them, he showed to the Inspector of the Library the manuscripts he intended to publish first, which were works of the fathers of the Greek Church unknown till that time. Gersdorf, who was

55. These MSS., referred to also on p. 163ff., were not in fact catalogued. The animosity of the learned world is a recurrent theme in Simonides' life be it in Germany, Greece or England.

about to undertake the publication of them, having taken the manuscripts in his hands, discovered most unexpectedly a portion of the pastoral writings of the Apostolic Father Hermas. This discovery greatly delighted all present, and from that day they never ceased intreating Simonides to present the discovered portion to the University Library, promising that he should receive an equivalent return, and he, though he would not consent at first, was subsequently persuaded to accede to their request. Having handed over the manuscript and a copy of the part wanting, which Simonides had made himself while in Mount Athos (for he had not the whole of the manuscript with him) and also a clean copy for publication, he received the money agreed upon shortly after the publication of the work.

A short time before the publication of the Hermas he communicated to Lycurgus the existence of another Hermaean manuscript, preserved in palimpsests. He afterwards communicated the like intelligence to Anger, and this manuscript was brought from Alexandria to Leipsic, after the publication of the Hermas, at the reiterated request of Anger and Dindorf. This preference given to the two latter gentlemen appears to have given considerable annoyance to Professor Tissendorf, and hence arose a jealousy that was most unfavourable to Simonides. It was reported by Tissendorf that there was a deception in the manuscript of Hermas, and that the deception was evidently intended to mislead. A controversy arose in consequence, in which Tissendorf was supported by Lycurgus; and Simonides, who was greatly enraged against Lycurgus, published a pamphlet under the title of «The Sycophant Lycurgus», and in which he explained the whole matter, and put his adversaries to shame by showing that the manuscript Hermas was correct and that the common Latin translations from which it differed had been made, not in accordance with the Greek originals, but to suit the views of the Latin translators, who had put into the mouth of the Apostolic Father Hermas doctrinal opinions quite inconsistent with the apostolical announcement, but eminently calculated to strengthen the position of the Church to which the translators belonged. The affair caused considerable excitêment among theologians, and as some of the chief dogmas of the Latin Church were severely attacked by an exposure of the fraud in the Latin translations, Simonides gained much ill-will among the members of that Church. It may here be observed that, up to the present time two editions of Hermas have appeared from two copies of Simonides. The first is the correct one, which was discovered in the monastery of Gregory in Mount Athos, written by Clemens of Larissa in 1475, and first published by Anger and Dindorf at Leipsic in 1856. The second transcribed in the vernacular by Abraham of Telos in 1821, and therefore corrupt, was discovered in Mount Athos in the monastery of Dionysius in 1851, and published at Leipsic in the series of the Apostolic Fathers by Tissendorf, though he must certainly have been acquainted with the corrupt state of

the book. Both, however, are incomplete towards the end; but Simonides has lately published the remainder in his book of the Four Theological Writings, preceding it by the life of the Apostolic Father Hermas, so important to ecclesiastical history, and together with of those bearing the same name as Hermas, and other matters no less curious, since they were all unknown till their publication by Simonides. But besides the two manuscripts of Hermas in question, which he discovered in Mount Athos, he discovered seven others, some of which are of the earliest centuries after Christ, and others more recent. To proceed, however, a little while before the publication of the Hermas, Professor Dindorf being informed of another palimpsest manuscript, very important, and entitled «Three Books of Records of the Egyptian Kings, by Uranius of Alexandria, son of Anaximenes»[1] and having seen it with his own eyes and handled it with his own hands, came to Simonides together with Anger, and was almost beside himself with joy and offered him a large price for it, adding that he would purchase it for the Bodleian library, of which he stated himself to be the representative. But Simonides paid no attention to what he said and gave him no answer at the time. However, when Dindorf again came to him and resumed the topic, he replied that he would by no means consent to let such a treasure out of his hands, especially before its publication, «For I desire, Herr Professor», said he, «that I myself and no other person should publish this most valuable record of Egyptian history, and the original befits the National Greek Library in Athens and no other library whatever». Hearing this Dindorf betook himself to Lycurgus, and after a long conversation with him about the purchase of the Uranius, endeavoured to obtain his end through his mediation, and therefore wrote a letter on the 24th of October, 1855, at once adulatory and urgent throughout. In this letter, while acknowledging the genuineness of the palimpsest of Uranius and admitting its great value, he speaks out the wish of his heart, viz., that he himself should annotate the work and publish it under the name of Simonides, and that Simonides should afterwards concede the manuscript to some European library through Dindorf. Simonides, when he understood the contents of the letter (for Dindorf wrote expressly to Lycurgus telling him to communicate the contents to Simonides at once), replied to Dindorf in accordance with his request. But afterwards, when he better understood the meaning of the letter, he recalled what he had written. Then Dindorf, greatly troubled, came as quickly as possible to Simonides and said that he agreed with the opinion of Simonides and wished him to hand over the original to the Bodleian Libary, and said that if Simonides would agree to this he would pay him 2,000 Saxon thalers, *not as an equivalent for the original,* but in return for a *copy* of the manuscript. On this distinct understanding, Therefore, Simonides delivered to him both the original and the transcript of

56. See p. 123f.

the Uranius, and Dindorf in the first place published a pamphlet at Oxford, concerning the manuscript, under the following title: «Uranii Alexandrini de regibus Aegyptiorum Libri Tres. Operis ex Codice Palimpsesto edendi Specimina proposuit Gulielmus Dindorfius Oxonii 1856». After the publication of this pamphlet Dindorf went to Berlin, and parted with the palimpsest of Uranius to the King of Prussia for 15,000 Prussian thalers, and this without the warrant of Simonides, and then, returning to Leipsic, paid him the 2,000 as his remuneration. After this, the trickery of Dindorf becoming known to Simonides through the newspapers of January 29th, 1856, he appealed against the treacherous Dindorf, whereupon, new machinations were devised against Simonides, that is to say, they accused him in the first place of having purloined the palimpsest from the Turkish Library, and secondly of having forged it himself. Accordingly upon this double charge he was arrested on the 1st of February, *1856*, at the very time when he was waiting for a carriage in order to remove with his property into another house, which he had occupied already for a month, as the magistrate who examined him was convinced on inquiry, and not, as his accusers falsely reported, because he was about to depart for London. Simonides, accordingly, being arrested was detained 17 days, and replied ably and gallantly to all the accusations against him. In his defence before the magistrates he said-«If the manuscript was stolen, as my accusers assert, from the Turkish Library, it is consequently genuine, and no charge of its being fictitious can avail; if I wrote it myself it is my private property, and no one has a right to deprive me of it. Again, if it was purloined, let them mention the place from which it was stolen and shew at the same time the catalogue of the library in which it is entered. And if it is my own work, as some ignorant persons have reported, who assail what is extraordinary as if it were an imposture, let them prove this scientifically, and if it be proved, I will willingly submit to whatever punishment the laws decree. But if it is true that I myself wrote the manuscripts then I have a right, I consider, to publish this learned work in my own name, as well as all the other learned productions of the same author, sixty in all, inscribe them with the name of Simonides and strike out that of Uranius. In that case I shall be justly celebrated as the cleverest of men». The magistrates again asked him if he purloined it from the library of the present Sultan, Abdul Medjid, and he very properly relied that the Sultan had no library, and that the Sultans do not even know what a library is. The tribunal of Leipsic, having no proof against Simonides, and being convinced that he was unjustly persecuted, and that the accusation was made solely to get possession of the palimpsest, in order that it might afterwards be presented to the King of Prussia, acquitted him at once, and he was set at liberty.[57] But the Prussian Ministry an-

57. The official version of the trial is given in Simonides und Sein Prozess (Berlin, 1856). The fact that it was deemed necessary to publish a report of this nature shows the significance and importance of Simonides' activities.

ticipating this, demanded Simonides, in order to hear from him *viva voce* the real truth concerning this affair. At first the Saxon Government rejected the demand of the Prussian Ministry, but afterwards, having received the assent of Simonides, and an undertaking from the Minister of Justice that no harm should befall him, but that he should be indemnified for what he had suffered, they surrendered him.

Accordingly Simonides, having gone to Berlin on the 17th of February with the representative of the Prussian Foreign Office, was again subjected to even a severer examination, and related in full the history of the discovery of the Uranius. In Berlin, also, he was fully acquitted, and being freed from the accusation, held his accusers up to scorn. Herr Lepsius, in fact, he not only held up to scorn, but accused-with good reason-of theft, for he stole many of Simonides' effects, when Stiber, the officer of the Municipality, who had received the chest of Simonides from the Saxon government sealed with the Royal seal of Saxony, handed it over, after breaking the seal, to his dear friend Lepsius. Truly a well-ordered government! So Lepsius having become-as he desired-master of Simonides' chest, disposed of its contents as he thought fit; some he took away, others he destroyed, and a very few he returned to Herr Stiber. Those taken away were scarce coins, rubbings of unknown inscriptions, extensive annotations concerning hieroglyphic writings and the Egyptian language, as well as the Ethiopian, Lycian, Phoenician, and Carian languages, and concerning the Pelagian letters, and the ancient dialects of the Armenians. Besides these a portion of the copy of Uranius, especially that from the fifth to the twentieth dynasty, and moreover letters from distinguished persons, as Professor Mullach confessed in the court, for he said that he saw Lepsius throwing some English letters into a bag. From this it may, as it would seem, be inferred, that the seizure of Simonides and his unfair removal to Berlin was induced by a desire to obtain possession of his manuscripts. Some of the stolen property was actually found in the hands of Lepsius, as the tribunal of Berlin informed Simonides by a letter afterwards sent to him at Munich. Lepsius also purloined all the essays against Simonides that he could find, which the latter had collected with a view of some day replying to them. From these, and the memoranda furnished him by the followers of Rhancabe, Lepsius composed a ridiculous biography or satire. The biography is a matter very little to the credit of Lepsius, who, though he may be a learned man, is neither remarkable for his honesty nor his good taste. The affair in Berlin terminated by the restoration to Simonides of the original copy of Uranius, and by the Prussian municipality giving Simonides 500 thalers, which was presented to him with a strong recommendation that it would be better for him to leave Berlin. The Municipality therefore, having taken down the deposition of Simonides in writing, gave him a passport and the same day he returned to Leipsic by railway, to bid adieu to his friends. But his accusers at Leipsic hearing of his unexpected acquittal, and especially

that all his calumniators had been unmasked, and thinking he came to Leipsic on this account, made an unanimous onslaught upon him. Dindorf and Tissendorf, previously mortal enemies, became reconciled, and both went to the Mayor of Leipsic, and induced him, by various means, to send Simonides away from Saxony, saying that they, themselves, and with them the credit of the Leipsic University would be in danger if his assertions were authenticated. The end was that Simonides was banished from the Saxon territories on the 30th of March, 1856, and he went to Vienna the same day. The authorities of that place, knowing the unjust attack that had been made against him, gave him an asylum, received him in the kindest manner and furnished him abundantly with pecuniary resources and a handsome abode, and moreover sent an eminent physician to attend him. Here Simonides remained two months, noticed by the most distinguished men, and forming valuable acquaintances, and traversing a great portion of the Austrian dominions. Having recovered his health a little he next went to Munich, where he wrote and published the first essay concerning the genuineness of the Uranius, and shortly after undertook the editing of a periodical antiquarian work, entitled «Memnon», a work that displays his rare archaeological knowledge, especially with regard to Egyptian antiquities. Being, however, seriously ill in Munich, he removed thence, by the advice of his medical attendants, and travelled all over Bavaria and the neighbouring countries, after which he went to Russia through Saxony, and arrived at Brussels, where he remained some days, and went on to London, April 24th, *1858.*

One suspects it was this incident above all that led Simonides to attack Tischendorf in 1862 and to deflate the undoubted success the German scholar was having with his most important discovery.

This anti-German feeling appears again later in a letter supposedly received by Simonides from his mother's birthplace, the island of Syme:

> The Symaean Community to Simonides, their beloved fellow citizen, health and prosperity.
>
> The news of your innocence has reached us and given us the most heartfelt satisfaction. By the mere force of truth you have confounded your foes of enlightened Germany, and compelled them, like the vain glorious boaster of old, Goliath, to fall prostrate before the presence of Simonides, so to speak, that of truth.
>
> Courage, child of your country, and never cease proclaiming the truth, for in the God of truth and light, and in the prayers of your fathers, you have a shield and protection, and no weapon, however powerful, will ever be able to penetrate the breastplate with which you are armed by the grace of Heaven.
>
> Have courage, we repeat, and persevere in your endeavours for the enlightenment of the human race in spite of all the obstacles that may be

thrown in your way by the powerful ones of the earth and the persecutors of truth; for though they appear powerful, and armed with a breastplate of iron, they are powerless, and the well-armed shafts of truth will, in the twinkling of an eye, overthrow their machinations, and the iron wherein they are incased will be shattered into pieces like a vessel made of potter's clay.

Courage, therefore, we repeat again and again, and in full confidence sound the adamantine trumpet of truth, and be assured no one will ever succeed in drowning its sweet, but thundering-toned sounds, and the God of glory will enrol your name of the temple of immortality, and hand it down to the remotest posterity. Amen, amen, amen.

Michael Calaphatas Ioannides,
Secretary.

Symae, 25th March, in the year of Grace, 1858.

The remainder of the *Memoir* (about 40 pages) is mainly a list of the MSS. Simonides is alleged to have discovered and was about to publish (but in fact never did). The authenticity of all these MSS. is said to be proven. We are also told of those MSS. which are now in private hands-in particular Sir Thomas Phillipps[58], who seems to have been duped by Simonides into purchasing some of his MSS.

One telling passage in the concluding section of the *Memoir* has a bearing on Sinaiticus in an ironic way. In 1859 when the *Memoir* was written Simonides (or at least «Charles Stewart») stresses the unlikelihood that Simonides would ever need to copy MSS. himself:

> In Italy the art of forging manuscripts was commonly practised, and indeed, in the time of Laurentius, who founded the Laurentine Library, many MSS. were forged in Italy and were disposed of as documents of a high degree of antiquity. But nothing of this kind was ever practised at Athos. The Italian monks had a direct motive and interest in these forgeries, for their productions obtained a large price and were a constant source of pecuniary profit; but this motive was entirely wanting in Mount Athos, where the monks regarded their manuscripts as the most valuable of their possessions, and guarded them so jealously that travellers were not permitted to view them. Indeed, no amount of money would induce the monks of Mount Athos to part with the libraries they have guarded and

5 8 . Sir Thomas Phillipps bart (1792-1872) was the man who aimed to have one copy of every book in the world and may be better described as a bibliomaniac rather than a bibliophile. This ambition might have accounted for many of his indiscriminate purchases. At his death it was estimated he was in possession of 60,000 MSS and about 50,000 printed books. The disposal of Phillipps' collection has in fact taken more years than the acquisition. Sotheby's were auctioning parts of his collection up to 1976 and more still remains unsold. New Testament Greek cursive 2793 was auctioned by Sotheby's in London in 1972 where it was listed as having been bought by Phillipps from Simonides. On July 4th 1972 several of Simonides' forgeries were sold at Sotheby's.

protected through so many ages. The MSS. obtained by Mr. Curson and by Menas have never been disputed in any way-their authenticity was at once admitted-how then is it that the manuscripts of Simonides have been so bitterly attacked? It was rather to have been expected that his should be the most ancient and valuable of all that have been obtained from the sacred Mount, for he himself lived a considerable period in Mount Athos, and he has relatives there of great influence, two of whom were heads of monasteries for many years. He was, moreover, engaged whilst there in making a catalogue of the different Libraries, and was specially employed in writing an Archaeological History of Athos, from which it necessarily followed that he had free access to all the accumulations of manuscripts in the various monasteries. Such an opportunity as this, one which no other man had enjoyed from time immemorial, was not lost by Simonides, who made good use of his time, and discovered many of the writings of the most illustrious Greek authors. Among his discoveries especial notice may be taken of the «Epitome of the Greek Library of Diodorus Siculus», «The History of Dionysius of Helicarnassus», and the works of Stephanus Byzantinus. Of all these Simonides became the possessor, and if he had chosen he might have taken copies of all the valuable manuscripts in the Libraries, for there was no one to precent his doing so, or who would have opposed his wishes and designs in any way. Indeed every one there regarded him as their brother, and the same kind feeling is entertained towards him to the present day. This friendship and affection is given to him partly from his being the heir of a family endeared to the inhabitants of the Mount by intimate association through many centuries, and partly by the exceeding love and reverence felt for his uncle, the celebrated Benedict. There is, however, another and more personal cause for the esteem in which Simonides is held in the Mount, and this is to be found in the gratitude the inhabitants owe him for services rendered in various ways, but more particularly when he was in Russia, when he had several opportunities of conferring on them the most important benefits by the exercise of his political influence. Seeing, then, that Simonides was daily in the midst of the largest and most important collections of ancient manuscripts at present in existence, and that he had only to express the desire to possess any particular manuscript and it became his own, it is the height of folly to suppose that this man would deliberately set to work at the laborious, dangerous, and dishonourable task of forging manuscripts, when the genuine articles could be obtained by stretching out his hand. Simonides has been unceasingly employed during the whole of his life,-his time has been fully occupied by his studies and his various engagements,-and yet some persons have said that the manuscripts in his possession are his own forgeries, though to forge them would occasion an enormous expenditure of time and labour and would involve the acquisition of many branches of science. Is it reasonable to suppose that a man who could have his choice of countless manuscripts

of unquestionable authenticity, would give up his time and attention to manufacturing false ones, and that, too, when there was no possible motive or reason for his doing so? If Simonides neglected his opportunity of securing manuscripts when in Mount Athos, he is a much more foolish man than his enemies represent him; but even they can hardly suppose him to be so completely devoid of common sense as to take the labour of forging manuscripts when he could have true ones for the asking.

But as we have seen it was only three years later that Simonides vigorously defended his skill in copying MSS. and producing Codex Sinaiticus.

Babington C. 123, 138, 145
Bradshaw H. 24, 36, 42, 43, 44, 68, 78, 123
Callinicos (or Callinicus or Kallinicos) see Kallinikos
Cureton W. 142, 147, 153
Davies J.S. 16, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 115, 116
Davis E.J. 103, 104, 112, 115, 117, 118
Dindorf W. 59, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 131, 170, 182, 183, 184, 185, 187
Drakakis (or Drakakes) see Drakachis
Drakachis L. 44, 45, 52
Ehrenberg M. 126, 127, 128
Goodwin C.W. 153, 154, 155, 158, 161
Hodgkin J.E. 16, 26, 36, 39, 40, 42, 44, 45, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 67, 73, 79, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 115, 139, 155, 157, 158, 160, 161, 163, 173
Hort F.J.A. 15, 23, 26
Irons W.J. 96, 100
Kallinikos 37, 71-121
Lepsius R. 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 143, 186
Lycourgos see Lycurgus
Lycurgus A. 33, 128, 131, 173, 174, 182, 183, 184
Madden F. 127, 148, 153, 164, 167, 182
Mayer J. 99, 123, 131-163
Metzger B.M. 15
Newenham W.T. 36, 66, 67
Nicolaides 101, 143, 173
Pertz G.H. 125, 127, 129
Phillipps T. 26, 123, 167, 168, 182, 188
Porphyry U. 21, 22, 31, 51, 77
Rawlinson H.C. 100, 153, 169
Scrivener F.H.A. 16, 26, 48, 51, 53, 54, 65, 68
Sevcenko I. 15, 18, 25
Sotheby S.L. 153, 164, 167, 170
Steuart see Stewart
Stewart C. 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 54, 55, 59, 64, 79, 123, 139, 153, 173, 174, 175, 176, 180, 188

Stobart H.	134, 138, 141, 144, 145, 147, 148, 149, 151, 154, 159, 160
Tischendorf C. von	9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 31, 32, 34, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 69, 71, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 84, 85, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 99, 104, 106, 109, 112, 113, 114, 120, 121, 131, 152, 173, 174, 180, 183, 187
Tregelles S.P.	20, 23, 24, 26, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 42, 46, 47, 67, 69, 78, 79, 98, 122, 123, 131, 147, 163, 173, 176
Vaux W.S.W.	36, 100, 101, 126, 153, 158, 161
West G.	115, 116
Wilkinson R.	71, 72, 73, 75
Woollcomb W.W.	16
Wright W.A.	20, 36, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 60, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 78, 79, 80, 83, 85, 86, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103 106, 115, 122, 163, 173, 174, 176